arXiv:1406.1341v1 [math.CO] 5 Jun 2014

Cascades and Obstructions of Low Connectivity for Embedding Graphs into the Klein Bottle

Bojan Mohar *† Petr Škoda

Department of Mathematics,
Simon Fraser University,
8888 University Drive,
Burnaby, BC, Canada.

Abstract

The structure of graphs with a 2-vertex-cut that are critical with respect to the Euler genus is studied. A general theorem describing the building blocks is presented. These constituents, called hoppers and cascades, are classified for the case when Euler genus is small. As a consequence, the complete list of obstructions of connectivity 2 for embedding graphs into the Klein bottle is obtained.

1 Introduction

Robertson and Seymour [11] proved that for each surface $\mathbb{S}$ the class of graphs that embed into $\mathbb{S}$ can be characterized by a finite list Forb($\mathbb{S}$) of minimal forbidden minors (or *obstructions*). For the 2-sphere $\mathbb{S}_0$, Forb($\mathbb{S}_0$) consists of the *Kuratowski graphs*, K_5 and $K_{3,3}$ [5]. The list of obstructions Forb($\mathbb{N}_1$) for the projective plane $\mathbb{N}_1$ already contains 35 graphs and $\mathbb{N}_1$ is the only other surface for which the complete list of forbidden minors is known [1, 4]. For the torus $\mathbb{S}_1$, the complete list of obstructions is still not known, but thousands of obstructions were generated by the use of computers (see [3, 8, 15]).

The obstructions for the Klein bottle are even less understood than those for the torus. Even though no list of obstructions have been constructed so far, it is expected that the total number of obstructions for the Klein bottle will be in tens of thousand. Henry Glover (private communication to B.M.) conjectured that there will be many more. In fact, Glover made a speculation that more than 10^6 obstructions will be obtained by pasting together two

*Supported in part by an NSERC Discovery Grant (Canada), by the Canada Research Chair program, and by the Research Grant P1–0297 of ARRS (Slovenia).

†On leave from: IMFM & FMF, Department of Mathematics, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia.

obstructions for the projective plane by identifying two vertices in all possible ways. One of the side results of this paper is a refutation of this conjecture.

In this paper, we study critical graphs for Euler genus of low connectivity. For a graph G, we denote by $\widehat{g}(G)$ its Euler genus; see Section 2 for definitions. A graph G is *critical* for Euler genus k if $\widehat{g}(G) > k$ and for each edge $e \in E(G)$, $\widehat{g}(G-e) \leq k$ and $\widehat{g}(G/e) \leq k$, where G/e denotes the graph obtained from G by contracting the edge e. Let $\mathcal{E}_k$ be the class of critical graphs for Euler genus k and $\mathcal{E} = \bigcup_{k\geq 0} \mathcal{E}_k$. It is easy to show that graphs in $\mathcal{E}$ that are not 2-connected can be obtained as disjoint unions and 1-sums of graphs in $\mathcal{E}$ (see [13]). Here we study graphs in $\mathcal{E}$ of *connectivity* 2, that is, graphs that are 2-connected but not 3-connected. We shall show that each critical graph for Euler genus of connectivity 2 can be obtained as a 2-sum of two graphs that are close to graphs in $\mathcal{E}$ or belong to an exceptional class of graphs, called *cascades* (see Sect. 9 and 10). In Sect. 5, we construct the list of critical graphs for Euler genus 2 of connectivity 2. In Sect. 6, we show that a graph of connectivity 2 is critical for Euler genus 2 if and only if it is an obstruction for the Klein bottle. This yields a complete list of obstructions for the Klein bottle of connectivity 2. The list of obstructions for embeddability in the Klein bottle (and for Euler genus 2) contains precisely 668 graphs of connectivity two. This is in strong contrast with predictions of Henry Glover, who estimated that the number of Klein bottle obstructions of connectivity two will be more than a million (private communication). An analogous result for the torus is given in [7]. However, the methods used in that paper are quite different from those in this one. The main difference is the appearance of cascades, whose treatment occupies about half of this paper.

The above-mentioned result that obstructions of connectivity two for Euler genus 2 and the nonorientable genus 2 are the same is just a coincidence. It is easy to see that it no longer holds for larger genus. Also, there are 3-connected obstructions for Euler genus 2 that are not Klein bottle obstructions. One example is the following graph. Let Q be the graph obtained from K_7 by first subdividing two of its edges that have no vertex in common and then adding an edge joining both vertices of degree two used in the subdivision. Since K_7 does not embed in the Klein bottle, Q is not an obstruction for this surface. However, Q cannot be embedded in the torus and, as the reader may verify, deleting or contracting any edge gives a graph of genus one. So, Q is an obstruction for the torus and an obstruction for Euler genus 2.

In classifying obstructions of connectivity two, we encounter two special families of graphs that are the building blocks of such obstructions. The first class are mysterious graphs called *hoppers*. While we prove that hoppers do not exist when the genus is small, and we are not able to construct any for larger genus, we believe that they may show up when the genus is large enough. Their existence is closely related to an old open problem dating back to the 1980's asking if there exists a graph which is simultaneously an obstruction for two different nonorientable surfaces.[1] For such an obstruction, deleting or contracting any edge would

[1]This problem was proposed in various incarnations by Dan Archdeacon, Bruce Richter, and Jozef Širan, and appears as Problem #1 in the list of open problems in topological graph theory compiled by Dan Archdeacon in 1995 (`http://www.emba.uvm.edu/~darchdea/problems/decgenus.htm`).

reduce the nonorientable genus by at least two.

The graphs in the second family that we encounter are called *cascades*. We determine all cascades when the genus is small. The proofs use methods from structural graph theory and involve development of results about extensions of embeddings of subgraphs. The classification of cascades for Euler genus 2 occupies almost half of the paper and is the most complicated part of the paper.

In the first part of the paper, obstructions of connectivity two for arbitrary Euler genus are examined. It is shown that we encounter the same behavior as for the small genus, except that we are unable to say much about hoppers and cascades.

2 Preliminaries

Let G be a connected multigraph. An *embedding* of G is a pair $\Pi = (\pi, \lambda)$ where $\pi = (\pi_v \mid v \in V(G))$ is a *rotation system*, which assigns each vertex v a cyclic permutation π_v of the edges incident with v, and λ is a *signature* mapping which assigns each edge $e \in E(G)$ a *sign* $\lambda(e) \in \{-1, 1\}$. For an edge e incident to v, the cyclic sequence $e, \pi_v(e), \pi_v^2(e), \ldots, e$ is called the *local rotation* at v. Given an embedding Π of G, we say that G is Π-*embedded*.

A Π-*face* of a Π-embedded graph G is a cyclic sequence of triples (v_i, e_i, s_i), where $v_i \in V(G)$, e_i is an edge incident with v_i, and $s_i \in \{1, -1\}$, satisfying the following (with indices being cyclic):

(i) $e_i = v_i v_{i+1}$,

(ii) $s_{i+1} = s_i \lambda(e_i)$, and

(iii) $e_{i+1} = \pi_{v_{i+1}}^{s_{i+1}}(e_i)$.

Two consecutive tuples $(v, e, s), (v', e', s')$ of a Π-face W give a Π-*angle* e, v', e' of W. Let $F(\Pi)$ be the set of Π-faces. The *Euler genus* of Π is given by Euler's formula.

$$|V(G)| - |E(G)| + |F(G)| = 2 - \widehat{g}(\Pi).$$

The *Euler genus* $\widehat{g}(G)$ of a graph G is the minimum Euler genus of an embedding of G.

If G contains a cycle that contains odd number of edges of negative signature, we say that Π is *nonorientable*. Otherwise, Π is *orientable*. The *orientable* genus $g(G)$ is half of the minimum genus of an orientable combinatorial embedding of G. If G contains at least one cycle, then the *nonorientable genus* $\widetilde{g}(G)$ is the minimum Euler genus of a nonorientable embedding of G, else $\widetilde{g}(G) = 0$. The following relation is an easy observation (see [6]).

Lemma 2.1. *For every connected graph G which is not a tree,*

$$\widetilde{g}(G) \leq 2g(G) + 1.$$

If $\widetilde{g}(G) = 2g(G) + 1$, then G is said to be *orientably simple*. Note that in this case $\widehat{g}(G) = 2g(G) = \widetilde{g}(G) - 1$, i.e., the Euler genus of G is even.

In this paper, we will deal mainly with the class $\mathcal{G}$ of simple graphs. Let $G \in \mathcal{G}$ be a simple graph and e an edge of G. Then $G - e$ denotes the graph obtained from G by *deleting* e and G/e denotes the graph[2] obtained from G by *contracting* e. It is convenient for us to formalize these graph operations. The set $\mathcal{M}(G) = E(G) \times \{-, /\}$ is the *set of minor-operations* available for G. An element $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G)$ is called a *minor-operation* and μG denotes the graph obtained from G by applying μ. For example, if $\mu = (e, -)$ then $\mu G = G - e$. A graph H is a *minor* of G if H can be obtained from a subgraph of G by contracting some edges. If G is connected, then H can be obtained from G by a sequence of minor-operations.

We shall use the following well-known result.

Theorem 2.2 (Stahl and Beineke [13])**.** *The Euler genus of a graph is the sum of the Euler genera of its blocks.*

Generally, we are interested in minor-minimal graphs (with some property). The closely related classes of deletion-minimal graphs appear naturally. Let $\mathrm{Forb}^*(\mathbb{S})$ be the class of graphs of minimum degree at least 3 that do not embed into $\mathbb{S}$ but are minimal such with respect to taking subgraphs. Similarly, let $\mathcal{E}_k^*$ be the class of graphs of minimum degree at least 3 such that $\widehat{g}(G) > k$ but $\widehat{g}(G - e) \leq k$ for each edge $e \in E(G)$. Again, we let $\mathcal{E}^* = \bigcup_{k \geq 0} \mathcal{E}_k^*$.

Let us note that the neighbors of a vertex of degree 3 cannot be adjacent in a graph that is minimally non-embeddable on a surface.

Observation 2.3. *Let uvw be a triangle in a graph G. If u has degree 3, then every embedding of $G - vw$ into a surface can be extended to an embedding of G into the same surface.*

3 Graphs with terminals

We study the class $\mathcal{G}_{xy}$ of graphs with two special vertices x and y, called *terminals*. Most notions that are used for graphs can be used in the same way for graphs with terminals. Some notions differ though and, to distinguish between graphs with and without terminals, let $\widehat{G}$ be the underlying graph of G without terminals (for $G \in \mathcal{G}_{xy}$). Two graphs, G_1 and G_2, in $\mathcal{G}_{xy}$ are *isomorphic*, also denoted $G_1 \cong G_2$, if there is an isomorphism of the graphs $\widehat{G_1}$ and $\widehat{G_2}$ that maps terminals of G_1 onto terminals of G_2 (and non-terminals onto non-terminals), possibly exchanging x and y. We define minor-operations on graphs in $\mathcal{G}_{xy}$ in the way that $\mathcal{G}_{xy}$ is a minor-closed class. When performing edge contractions on $G \in \mathcal{G}_{xy}$, we do not allow contraction of the edge xy (if $xy \in E(G)$) and when contracting an edge incident with a terminal, the resulting vertex becomes a terminal.

[2]When contracting an edge, one may obtain multiple edges. We shall replace any multiple edges by single edges as such a simplification has no effect on the genus.

Parameter	Definition	Range
$\widehat{g}(G)$	Euler genus	≥ 0
$\widehat{g}^+(G)$	$\widehat{g}(G+xy)$	≥ 0
$\theta(G)$	$\widehat{g}^+(G) - \widehat{g}(G)$	$0, 1, 2$
$\eta(G_1, G_2)$	$\theta(G_1) + \theta(G_2)$	$0, 1, 2, 3, 4$

Table 1: Genus parameters for graphs in $\mathcal{G}_{xy}$

We use $\mathcal{M}(G)$ to denote the set of available minor-operations for G. Since $(xy, /) \notin \mathcal{M}(G)$ for $G \in \mathcal{G}_{xy}$, we shall use G/xy to denote the underlying simple graph in $\mathcal{G}$ obtained from G by identification of x and y. In particular, we do not require the edge xy to be present in G.

A *graph parameter* is a function $\mathcal{G} \to \mathbb{R}$ that is constant on each isomorphism class of $\mathcal{G}$. Similarly, we call a function $\mathcal{G}_{xy} \to \mathbb{R}$ a *graph parameter* if it is constant on each isomorphism class of $\mathcal{G}_{xy}$. A graph parameter $\mathcal{P}$ is *minor-monotone* if $\mathcal{P}(H) \leq \mathcal{P}(G)$ for each graph $G \in \mathcal{G}_{xy}$ and each minor H of G. The Euler genus is an example of a minor-monotone graph parameter.

For $G \in \mathcal{G}_{xy}$, the graph G^+ is the graph obtained from G by adding the edge xy if it is not already present. We can view the Euler genus of G^+ as a graph parameter $\widehat{g}^+$ of G, $\widehat{g}^+(G) = \widehat{g}(G^+)$. Note that $\widehat{g}^+$ is minor-monotone. The difference of $\widehat{g}^+$ and $\widehat{g}$ is a parameter θ, that is, $\theta(G) = \widehat{g}(G^+) - \widehat{g}(G)$. Note that $\theta(G) \in \{0, 1, 2\}$.

Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a graph parameter. A graph G is *$\mathcal{P}$-critical* if $\mathcal{P}(\mu G) < \mathcal{P}(G)$ for each $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G)$. Let H be a subgraph of a graph G (possibly with terminals) and $\mathcal{P}$ a graph parameter. We say that H is *$\mathcal{P}$-tight* if $\mathcal{P}(\mu G) < \mathcal{P}(G)$ for every minor-operation $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(H)$. We observe that $\mathcal{P}$-critical graphs have $\mathcal{P}$-tight subgraphs:

Lemma 3.1. *Let $H_1, \ldots, H_s$ be subgraphs of a graph G (possibly with terminals). If $E(H_1) \cup \cdots \cup E(H_s) = E(G)$, then G is $\mathcal{P}$-critical if and only if $H_1, \ldots, H_s$ are $\mathcal{P}$-tight.*

Let $\mathcal{G}^\circ_{xy}$ be the subclass of $\mathcal{G}_{xy}$ that consists of graphs that do not contain the edge xy. For graphs $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_{xy}$ such that $V(G_1) \cap V(G_2) = \{x, y\}$, the graph $G = (V(G_1) \cup V(G_2), E(G_1) \cup E(G_2))$ is the *xy-sum* of G_1 and G_2. The graphs G_1 and G_2 are called *parts* of G. Let G be the xy-sum of $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_{xy}$. We define the following two parameters:

$$\widehat{h}_0(G) = \widehat{g}(G_1) + \widehat{g}(G_2) + 2; \tag{1}$$

$$\widehat{h}_1(G) = \widehat{g}^+(G_1) + \widehat{g}^+(G_2). \tag{2}$$

Eq. (2) can be rewritten in a form similar to Eq. (1).

$$\widehat{h}_1(G) = \widehat{g}(G_1) + \widehat{g}(G_2) + \theta(G_1) + \theta(G_2) = \widehat{g}(G_1) + \widehat{g}(G_2) + \eta(G_1, G_2) \tag{3}$$

where $\eta(G_1, G_2) = \theta(G_1) + \theta(G_2)$. Note that $\eta(G_1, G_2) \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$.

Richter [9] gave a precise formula for the Euler genus of a 2-sum that can be expressed using our notation as follows.

Theorem 3.2 (Richter [9]). *Let G be the xy-sum of connected graphs $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_{xy}$. Then*

(i) $\widehat{g}(G) = \min\{\widehat{h}_0(G), \widehat{h}_1(G)\}$,

(ii) $\widehat{g}^+(G) = \widehat{h}_1(G)$, *and*

(iii) $\theta(G) = \max\{\widehat{h}_1(G) - \widehat{h}_0(G), 0\}$.

We can rewrite (i) as

$$\widehat{g}(G) = \widehat{g}(G_1) + \widehat{g}(G_2) + \min\{\eta(G_1, G_2), 2\} \tag{4}$$

and as

$$\widehat{g}(G) = \widehat{g}^+(G_1) + \widehat{g}^+(G_2) + 2 - \max\{\eta(G_1, G_2), 2\}. \tag{5}$$

For a graph parameter $\mathcal{P}$, we say that a minor-operation $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G)$ *decreases* $\mathcal{P}$ by at least k if $\mathcal{P}(\mu G) \leq \mathcal{P}(G) - k$. The subset of $\mathcal{M}(G)$ that decreases $\mathcal{P}$ by at least k is denoted by $\Delta_k(\mathcal{P}, G)$. We write just $\Delta_k(\mathcal{P})$ when the graph is clear from the context. Note that a graph G is $\mathcal{P}$-critical precisely when $\mathcal{M}(G) = \Delta_1(\mathcal{P})$. The following observation is stated for later reference.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $G \in \mathcal{G}_{xy}$. Then $\widehat{g}(G) \leq \widehat{g}^+(G) \leq \widehat{g}(G) + 2$. Furthermore, for $\theta = \theta(G)$ and $k \geq 0$, we have*

(S1) $\Delta_{k+2-\theta}(\widehat{g}) \subseteq \Delta_k(\widehat{g}^+)$ *and*

(S2) $\Delta_{k+\theta}(\widehat{g}^+) \subseteq \Delta_k(\widehat{g})$.

Proof. Suppose that $\mu \in \Delta_{k+2-\theta}(\widehat{g})$, i.e., $\widehat{g}(G) \geq \widehat{g}(\mu G) + k + 2 - \theta$. Then $\widehat{g}^+(G) = \widehat{g}(G) + \theta \geq \widehat{g}(\mu G) + k + 2 \geq \widehat{g}^+(\mu G) + k$. This shows that $\mu \in \Delta_k(\widehat{g}^+)$ and proves (S1). Property (S2) is verified in the same way. □

As an example, take a graph G with $\widehat{g}(G) = 1$ and $\widehat{g}^+(G) = 2$. Then (S2) for $k = 1$ says that $\Delta_2(\widehat{g}^+) \subseteq \Delta_1(\widehat{g})$, or that each minor-operation that decreases the Euler genus of G^+ by at least 2 also decreases the Euler genus of G by at least 1.

The next lemma describes when a minor-operation in a part of a 2-sum decreases $\widehat{g}$ of the 2-sum.

Lemma 3.4. *Let G be the xy-sum of connected graphs $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}^\circ_{xy}$ and let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G_1)$ be a minor-operation such that μG_1 is connected. Then $\widehat{g}(\mu G) < \widehat{g}(G)$ if and only if the following is true (where $\Delta_k(\cdot)$ always refer to the decrease of the parameter in G_1):*

(i) *If $\eta(G_1, G_2) = 0$, then $\mu \in \Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+)$.*

(ii) *If $\eta(G_1, G_2) = 1$, then $\mu \in \Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \Delta_2(\widehat{g})$.*

(iii) *If $\eta(G_1, G_2) = 2$, then $\mu \in \Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \Delta_1(\widehat{g})$.*

(iv) *If* $\eta(G_1, G_2) = 3$, *then* $\mu \in \Delta_2(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \Delta_1(\widehat{g})$.

(v) *If* $\eta(G_1, G_2) = 4$, *then* $\mu \in \Delta_1(\widehat{g})$.

Proof. Assume first that $\widehat{g}(\mu G) < \widehat{g}(G)$. Suppose that $\eta(G_1, G_2) \leq 2$ and that $\mu \notin \Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+)$. Since μG_1 is connected and $\widehat{h}_1(\mu G) = \widehat{h}_1(G)$, Theorem 3.2 gives that $\widehat{g}(\mu G) = \widehat{h}_0(G)$. Thus using Eq. (4), we obtain that

$$\widehat{g}(\mu G_1) + \widehat{g}(G_2) + 2 = \widehat{h}_0(\mu G) = \widehat{g}(\mu G) < \widehat{g}(G) \leq \widehat{g}(G_1) + \widehat{g}(G_2) + \eta(G_1, G_2).$$

If $\eta(G_1, G_2) = 0$, then $\widehat{g}(\mu G_1) < \widehat{g}(G_1) - 2$. Thus $\mu \in \Delta_3(\widehat{g})$ and, since $\Delta_3(\widehat{g}) \subseteq \Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+)$ by (S1), $\mu \in \Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+)$, a contradiction. We conclude that (i) holds. If $\eta(G_1, G_2) = 1$, then $\mu \in \Delta_2(\widehat{g})$ and (ii) holds. If $\eta(G_1, G_2) = 2$, then $\mu \in \Delta_1(\widehat{g})$ and (iii) holds.

Assume now that $\eta(G_1, G_2) \geq 3$ and assume that $\mu \notin \Delta_1(\widehat{g})$. Then $\widehat{h}_0(\mu G) = \widehat{h}_0(G)$. Consequently, by Theorem 3.2, $\widehat{g}(\mu G) = \widehat{h}_1(G)$. Thus using Eq. (5), we have

$$\widehat{g}^+(\mu G_1) + \widehat{g}^+(G_2) = \widehat{h}_1(\mu G) = \widehat{g}(\mu G) < \widehat{g}(G) \leq \widehat{g}^+(G_1) + \widehat{g}^+(G_2) + 2 - \eta(G_1, G_2).$$

If $\eta(G_1, G_2) = 3$, then $\widehat{g}^+(\mu G_1) < \widehat{g}^+(G_1) - 1$. Hence $\mu \in \Delta_2(\widehat{g}^+)$ and (iv) holds. If $\eta(G_1, G_2) = 4$, then $\widehat{g}^+(\mu G_1) < \widehat{g}^+(G_1) - 2$. Thus $\mu \in \Delta_3(\widehat{g}^+)$ and, since $\Delta_3(\widehat{g}^+) \subseteq \Delta_1(\widehat{g})$ by (S2), $\mu \in \Delta_1(\widehat{g})$, a contradiction. We conclude that (v) holds.

To prove the "if" part of the lemma, assume that (i)–(v) hold. We need to show that $\widehat{g}(\mu G) < \widehat{g}(G)$. Assume first that $\eta(G_1, G_2) \leq 2$ and $\mu \in \Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+)$. By Theorem 3.2 and (5),

$$\widehat{g}(\mu G) \leq \widehat{h}_0(\mu G) = \widehat{g}^+(\mu G_1) + \widehat{g}^+(G_2) < \widehat{g}^+(G_1) + \widehat{g}^+(G_2) = \widehat{h}_0(G) = \widehat{g}(G).$$

Assume now that $\eta(G_1, G_2) \geq 2$ and $\mu \in \Delta_1(\widehat{g})$. By Theorem 3.2 and (4),

$$\widehat{g}(\mu G) \leq \widehat{h}_1(\mu G) = \widehat{g}(\mu G_1) + \widehat{g}(G_2) + 2 < \widehat{g}(G_1) + \widehat{g}(G_2) + 2 = \widehat{h}_1(G) = \widehat{g}(G).$$

If $\eta(G_1, G_2) = 1$ and $\mu \in \Delta_2(\widehat{g})$, then using (4),

$$\widehat{g}(\mu G) \leq \widehat{h}_1(\mu G) = \widehat{g}(\mu G_1) + \widehat{g}(G_2) + 2 < \widehat{g}(G_1) + \widehat{g}(G_2) + 1 = \widehat{g}(G).$$

If $\eta(G_1, G_2) = 3$ and $\mu \in \Delta_2(\widehat{g}^+)$, then using (5),

$$\widehat{g}(\mu G) \leq \widehat{h}_0(\mu G) = \widehat{g}^+(\mu G_1) + \widehat{g}^+(G_2) < \widehat{g}^+(G_1) + \widehat{g}^+(G_2) - 1 = \widehat{g}(G).$$

Since the cases (i)–(v) cover all possible values of η, at least one of the cases above occurs and we are done. □

Let us prove a similar lemma for $\widehat{g}^+$.

Lemma 3.5. *Let G be the xy-sum of connected graphs $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}^\circ_{xy}$ and let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G_1)$ be a minor-operation such that μG_1 is connected. Then $\widehat{g}^+(\mu G) < \widehat{g}^+(G)$ if and only if $\mu \in \Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+)$.*

$\eta(G_1, G_2)$	$\mathcal{M}(G_1)$
0	$\Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+)$
1	$\Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \Delta_2(\widehat{g})$
2	$\Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \Delta_1(\widehat{g})$
3	$\Delta_2(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \Delta_1(\widehat{g})$
4	$\Delta_1(\widehat{g})$

Table 2: Possible outcomes for a minor-operation in a $\widehat{g}$-tight part of a 2-sum.

Proof. Assume first that $\widehat{g}^+(\mu G) < \widehat{g}^+(G)$. Since μG_1 is connected, Theorem 3.2 gives that $\widehat{g}^+(\mu G) = \widehat{h}_1(G)$. Using Eq. (2), we have that

$$\widehat{g}^+(\mu G_1) + \widehat{g}^+(G_2) = \widehat{h}_1(\mu G) = \widehat{g}^+(\mu G) < \widehat{g}^+(G) = \widehat{h}_1(G) = \widehat{g}^+(G_1) + \widehat{g}(G_2).$$

Thus $\widehat{g}^+(\mu G_1) < \widehat{g}^+(G_1)$. Hence $\mu \in \Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+)$.

On the other hand, assume that $\mu \in \Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+)$. Thus $\widehat{g}^+(\mu G_1) < \widehat{g}^+(G_1)$. By Theorem 3.2 and Eq. (2),

$$\widehat{g}^+(\mu G) = \widehat{g}^+(\mu G_1) + \widehat{g}^+(G_2) < \widehat{g}^+(G_1) + \widehat{g}^+(G_2) = \widehat{g}^+(G),$$

as claimed. □

In the statements of Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5, we required that μG_1 is connected. The next lemma shows that this is indeed the case for all minor-operations if G_1 is $\widehat{g}$-tight or $\widehat{g}^+$-tight in G. It is not hard to see that if G_1 is a connected graph, then μG_1 is disconnected if and only if μ is the deletion of a cutedge of G_1.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $G \in \mathcal{G}^\circ_{xy}$ be a connected graph with a cutedge e. Then $\widehat{g}(G/e) = \widehat{g}(G)$ and $\widehat{g}^+(G/e) = \widehat{g}^+(G)$.*

Proof. Let H_1 and H_2 be the components of $G - e$. By Theorem 2.2, $\widehat{g}(G/e) = \widehat{g}(H_1) + \widehat{g}(H_2) = \widehat{g}(G)$. If both x and y lie in H_1 (or H_2 by symmetry), then by Theorem 2.2, $\widehat{g}^+(G/e) = \widehat{g}(H_1 + xy) + \widehat{g}(H_2) = \widehat{g}^+(G)$. Suppose then that $x \in V(H_1)$ and $y \in V(H_2)$. If x (or y by symmetry) and w are the endpoints of e, then G^+ is the 1-sum of H_1 and $H_2+xy+xw$. Since $\widehat{g}(H_2 + yw) = \widehat{g}(H_2 + xy + xw)$, we have that $\widehat{g}^+(G/e) = \widehat{g}(H_1) + \widehat{g}(H_2 + yw) = \widehat{g}(H_1) + \widehat{g}(H_2 + xy + e) = \widehat{g}^+(G)$.

Therefore we may assume that e has endpoints $z \in V(H_1) \setminus \{x\}$ and $w \in V(H_2) \setminus \{y\}$. Let us view the graph G^+ as a yz-sum of graphs $H_1' = H_1 + xy$ and $H_2' = H_2 + e$. We have that $(e, /) \in \mathcal{M}(H_2')$ and $\widehat{g}(H_2'/e) = \widehat{g}(H_2')$ by Theorem 2.2 since e is a block of H_2'. Similarly, $\widehat{g}^+(H_2'/e) = \widehat{g}^+(H_2')$ since H_2'/e is homeomorphic to H_2' and thus admits the same embeddings. By applying Theorem 2.2 to G^+ as a yz-sum of H_1' and H_2', we obtain that $\widehat{g}(G^+/e) = \widehat{g}(G^+)$. We conclude that $\widehat{g}^+(G/e) = \widehat{g}^+(G)$. □

Lemma 3.6 easily implies that a $\widehat{g}$-tight or $\widehat{g}^+$-tight part G_1 of an xy-sum G has no cutedges. If e is a cutedge of G_1, then G_1/e is connected, $\widehat{g}(G_1/e) = \widehat{g}(G_1)$, and $\widehat{g}^+(G_1/e) = \widehat{g}^+(G_1)$. By Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5, G_1 is neither $\widehat{g}$-tight nor $\widehat{g}^+$-tight in G. In particular, we may present the outcome of Lemma 3.4 in terms of $\mathcal{M}(G_1)$ as in Table 2.

4 Critical classes, cascades, and hoppers

For a graph parameter $\mathcal{P}$, let $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{P})$ denote the class of $\mathcal{P}$-critical graphs in $\mathcal{G}_{xy}$. Note that $G \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{P})$ if and only if $\mathcal{M}(G) = \Delta_1(\mathcal{P})$. We call $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{P})$ the *critical class* for $\mathcal{P}$. Let $\mathcal{C}^\circ(\mathcal{P})$ be the class $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{P}) \cap \mathcal{G}^\circ_{xy}$. We refine the class $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{P})$ according to the value of $\mathcal{P}$: Let $\mathcal{C}_k(\mathcal{P})$ denote the subclass of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{P})$ that contains precisely the graphs G for which $\mathcal{P}(G) = k+1$. Let $\mathcal{C}^\circ_k(\mathcal{P})$ be the class $\mathcal{C}_k(\mathcal{P}) \cap \mathcal{G}^\circ_{xy}$ of those $\mathcal{P}$-critical graphs that do not contain the edge xy.

Let us start this section by describing the relation between the classes $\mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g})$, $\mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$, and $\mathcal{E}$ (unlabeled graphs that are critical for the Euler genus). The next result follows from the definitions of $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g})$.

Lemma 4.1. *For $G \in \mathcal{G}^\circ_{xy}$, $\widehat{G} \in \mathcal{E}$ if and only if $G \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g})$.*

The next two lemmas describe the relation between the class $\mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$ and $\mathcal{E}$.

Lemma 4.2. *For $G \in \mathcal{G}^\circ_{xy}$, $\widehat{G^+} \in \mathcal{E}$ if and only if $G \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$, $\theta(G) > 0$, and $\widehat{g}(G/xy) < \widehat{g}^+(G)$.*

Proof. Let $H = \widehat{G^+}$. Note that $\widehat{g}(H) = \widehat{g}^+(G)$ and $\mathcal{M}(H) = \mathcal{M}(G) \cup \{(xy,-),(xy,/)\}$. Since $\widehat{g}(\mu H) = \widehat{g}^+(\mu G)$ for each $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G)$, we get that $\widehat{g}(\mu H) < \widehat{g}(H)$ for each $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G)$ if and only if $G \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$. Since $H - xy \cong \widehat{G}$, we obtain that $\widehat{g}(H-xy) < \widehat{g}(H)$ if and only if $\theta(G) > 0$. Since $H/xy \cong G/xy$, we have that $\widehat{g}(H/xy) < \widehat{g}(H)$ if and only if $\widehat{g}(G/xy) < \widehat{g}^+(G)$. As $H \in \mathcal{E}$ if and only if $\widehat{g}(\mu H) < \widehat{g}(H)$ for each $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(H)$, the result follows. □

Lemma 4.3. *Let $G \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$. If $\theta(G) = 0$, then $\widehat{G} \in \mathcal{E}$. If $\theta(G) > 0$, then either $\widehat{G^+} \in \mathcal{E}$, or $\widehat{G^+} \in \mathcal{E}^*$ and $\widehat{G/xy} \in \mathcal{E}$.*

Proof. If $\theta(G) = 0$, then $\mathcal{M}(G) = \Delta_1(\widehat{g})$ by (S2) and thus $G \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g})$. Therefore $\widehat{G} \in \mathcal{E}$ by Lemma 4.1. Suppose now that $\theta(G) > 0$. Let $H = \widehat{G^+}$. Since $G \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$, we have that $\widehat{g}(\mu H) < \widehat{g}(H)$ for each $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G)$. As $\widehat{g}(H-xy) = \widehat{g}(G) < \widehat{g}(G) + \theta(G) = \widehat{g}(H)$, we have that $H \in \mathcal{E}^*$. If $\widehat{g}(G/xy) < \widehat{g}^+(G)$, then $H \in \mathcal{E}$ (since both deletion and contraction of xy decrease the Euler genus of H). Hence we may assume that $\widehat{g}(G/xy) = \widehat{g}^+(G)$. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G/xy)$ be a minor-operation in G/xy. Since μ is also a minor-operation in G, we obtain that

$$\widehat{g}(\mu(G/xy)) \leq \widehat{g}(\mu G^+) = \widehat{g}^+(\mu G) < \widehat{g}^+(G) = \widehat{g}(G/xy)$$

as $\mu(G/xy)$ is a minor of $\widehat{\mu G^+}$. Since μ was chosen arbitrarily, $G/xy \in \mathcal{E}$. □

A graph $G \in \mathcal{G}^\circ_{xy}$ is called a *cascade* if G satisfies the following properties:

(C1) $\mathcal{M}(G) = \Delta_1(\widehat{g}) \cup \Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+)$ (i.e., each minor operation decreases $\widehat{g}$ or $\widehat{g}^+$).

(C2) $G \notin \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g})$ (i.e., some minor operation does not decrease $\widehat{g}$).

(C3) $G \notin \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$ (i.e., some minor operation does not decrease $\widehat{g}^+$).

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the class of all cascades. We refine the class $\mathcal{S}$ according to the Euler genus. Let $\mathcal{S}_k$ be the subclass of $\mathcal{S}$ containing those graphs G for which $\widehat{g}^+(G) = k+1$. It is not hard to see that for $G \in \mathcal{S}_k$ we have that $\widehat{g}(G) = k$.

Lemma 4.4. *If $G \in \mathcal{S}$, then $\theta(G) = 1$.*

Proof. If $\theta(G) = 0$, then $\Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+) \subseteq \Delta_1(\widehat{g})$ by (S2), violating (C2). If $\theta(G) = 2$, then $\Delta_1(\widehat{g}) \subseteq \Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+)$ by (S1), violating (C3). Thus $\theta(G) = 1$. □

In this paper we shall show that the class of cascades is nonempty. In particular, we will determine the class $\mathcal{S}_1$ which appears as a class of building blocks for obstructions of connectivity 2 for the Klein bottle. The following lemma is an immediate consequence of (C1)–(C3).

Lemma 4.5. *Let $G \in \mathcal{G}^\circ_{xy}$. If $\mathcal{M}(G) = \Delta_1(\widehat{g}) \cup \Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+)$, then $G \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}) \cup \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \mathcal{S}$.*

We shall encounter another class of building blocks for obstructions of connectivity two. This class is more mysterious and we call them hoppers. Although it turns out that they do not exist when the genus is small (see Lemma 5.5), we suspect that they might appear when the genus becomes large. Their existence or nonexistence is intimately related to an old open question if there exist graphs that are obstructions for two different nonorientable surfaces.

Let $G \in \mathcal{G}^\circ_{xy}$. For a graph parameter $\mathcal{P}$, a graph G is a *$\mathcal{P}$-hopper* if every minor operation reduces the parameter by at least 2, i.e., $\mathcal{M}(G) = \Delta_2(\mathcal{P})$. Let $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{P})$ be the class of $\mathcal{P}$-hoppers. The subclass of $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{P})$ of graphs with $\mathcal{P}$ equal to $k+1$ is denoted by $\mathcal{H}_k(\mathcal{P})$. In this paper, we restrict our attention to $\widehat{g}$-hoppers and $\widehat{g}^+$-hoppers.

Let us define two weaker forms of hoppers. We say that G is a *weak $\widehat{g}$-hopper* if $G \notin \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$ and $\mathcal{M}(G) = \Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \Delta_2(\widehat{g})$. Note that necessarily $\theta(G) = 0$ by (S1); and $G \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g})$ by (S2). We say that G is a *weak $\widehat{g}^+$-hopper* if $G \notin \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g})$ and $\mathcal{M}(G) = \Delta_1(\widehat{g}) \cup \Delta_2(\widehat{g}^+)$. Note that $\theta(G) = 2$ by (S2) and $G \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$ by (S1). Let $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{w}}(\widehat{g})$ and $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{w}}(\widehat{g}^+)$ be the class of weak $\widehat{g}$-hoppers and weak $\widehat{g}^+$-hoppers, respectively. Let $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{w}}_k(\mathcal{P})$ be the subclass of $\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{w}}(\mathcal{P})$ such that $G \in \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{w}}_k(\mathcal{P})$ if $\mathcal{P}(G) = k+1$. The next result follows directly from the definition of weak hoppers.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $G \in \mathcal{G}^\circ_{xy}$. If $\mathcal{M}(G) = \Delta_2(\widehat{g}) \cup \Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+)$, then $G \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{w}}(\widehat{g})$. If $\mathcal{M}(G) = \Delta_1(\widehat{g}) \cup \Delta_2(\widehat{g}^+)$, then $G \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}) \cup \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{w}}(\widehat{g}^+)$.*

For the record we also state the following observation.

Observation 4.7. *The class $\mathcal{H}_k(\widehat{g})$ is empty if and only if each graph $G \in \mathcal{E}_{k-1}$ has $\widehat{g}(G) = k$.*

Let us now combine the properties of introduced classes with Lemma 3.4 to characterize $\widehat{g}$-tight and $\widehat{g}^+$-tight parts of a 2-sum of two graphs.

$\eta(G_1, G_2)$	G_1
0	$\mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$
1	$\mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{w}}(\widehat{g})$
2	$\mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}) \cup \mathcal{S}$
3	$\mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}) \cup \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{w}}(\widehat{g}^+)$
4	$\mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g})$

Table 3: Classification of $\widehat{g}$-tight parts of a 2-sum.

Theorem 4.8. *Let G be the xy-sum of connected graphs $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}^\circ_{xy}$. The subgraph G_1 is $\widehat{g}$-tight in G if and only if the following is true:*

(i) *If $\eta(G_1, G_2) = 0$, then $G_1 \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$.*

(ii) *If $\eta(G_1, G_2) = 1$, then $G_1 \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{w}}(\widehat{g})$.*

(iii) *If $\eta(G_1, G_2) = 2$, then $G_1 \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}) \cup \mathcal{S}$.*

(iv) *If $\eta(G_1, G_2) = 3$, then $G_1 \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}) \cup \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{w}}(\widehat{g}^+)$.*

(v) *If $\eta(G_1, G_2) = 4$, then $G_1 \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g})$.*

Proof. Assume first that G_1 is $\widehat{g}$-tight. By Lemma 3.6, μG_1 is connected for each $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G_1)$. If $\eta(G_1, G_2) = 0$, then $\mathcal{M}(G_1) = \Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+)$ by Lemma 3.4. Thus $G_1 \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$. Similarly, if $\eta(G_1, G_2) = 4$, then $G_1 \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g})$. If $\eta(G_1, G_2) = 1$, then $\mathcal{M}(G_1) = \Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \Delta_2(\widehat{g})$. By Lemma 4.6, $G_1 \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{w}}(\widehat{g})$. If $\eta(G_1, G_2) = 3$, then $\mathcal{M}(G_1) = \Delta_1(\widehat{g}) \cup \Delta_2(\widehat{g}^+)$. By Lemma 4.6, $G_1 \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}) \cup \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{w}}(\widehat{g}^+)$. Finally, if $\eta(G_1, G_2) = 2$, then $\mathcal{M}(G_1) = \Delta_1(\widehat{g}) \cup \Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+)$. By Lemma 4.4, $G_1 \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}) \cup \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \mathcal{S}$.

Assume now that (i)–(v) hold. Since $\mathcal{M}(G) = \Delta_1(\widehat{g}) \cup \Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+)$ for $G \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}) \cup \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{w}}(\widehat{g}) \cup \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{w}}(\widehat{g}^+)$, Lemma 3.6 asserts that μG_1 is connected for each $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G_1)$. Suppose first that $G_1 \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g})$. Since $\mathcal{M}(G) = \Delta_1(\widehat{g})$, we obtain for each $\eta(G_1, G_2) \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ that G_1 is $\widehat{g}$-tight by Lemma 3.4. A similar argument works if $G_1 \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$ and $\eta(G_1, G_2) \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. If $\eta(G_1, G_2) = 1$ and $G_1 \in \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{w}}(\widehat{g})$, then $\mathcal{M}(G_1) = \Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \Delta_2(\widehat{g})$ and G_1 is $\widehat{g}$-tight by Lemma 3.4. If $\eta(G_1, G_2) = 3$ and $G_1 \in \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{w}}(\widehat{g}^+)$, then $\mathcal{M}(G_1) = \Delta_2(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \Delta_1(\widehat{g})$ and G_1 is $\widehat{g}$-tight by Lemma 3.4. If $\eta(G_1, G_2) = 2$ and $G_1 \in \mathcal{S}$, then $\mathcal{M}(G_1) = \Delta_1(\widehat{g}) \cup \Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+)$ by (C1) and G_1 is $\widehat{g}$-tight by Lemma 3.4. This completes the proof since $\eta(G_1, G_2) \in \{0, \ldots, 4\}$ and we have proven that G_1 is $\widehat{g}$-tight in each case given by (i)–(v). □

The outcome of Theorem 4.8 is summarized in Table 3. There is an analogous theorem for $\widehat{g}^+$-tight parts of 2-sums.

Theorem 4.9. *Let G be the xy-sum of connected graphs $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}^\circ_{xy}$. The subgraph G_1 is $\widehat{g}^+$-tight in G if and only if $G_1 \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$.*

Proof. By Lemmas 3.5 and 3.6, G_1 is $\widehat{g}^+$-tight if and only if $\mathcal{M}(G_1) = \Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+)$. By definition, $G_1 \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$ if and only if $\mathcal{M}(G_1) = \Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+)$. □



(a) (b) (c)

Figure 1: The class $\mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g^+})$, the third graph is the sole member of the class $\mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g})$.

5 Excluded minors for Euler genus 2

In this section, we determine the classes $\mathcal{C}_2^\circ(\widehat{g})$, $\mathcal{C}_2^\circ(\widehat{g^+})$, and $\mathcal{E}_2$. We begin by showing that the classes $\mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g})$ and $\mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g^+})$ are related to Kuratowski graphs K_5 and $K_{3,3}$.

Lemma 5.1. *The class $\mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g})$ consists of a single graph that is isomorphic to $K_{3,3}$ with non-adjacent terminals (Fig. 1c). The class $\mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g^+})$ consists of the three graphs shown in Fig. 1.*

Proof. A graph has Euler genus greater than 0 if and only if it is non-planar. Since both K_5 and $K_{3,3}$ embed into projective plane, $\mathcal{E}_0 = \text{Forb}(\mathbb{S}_0) = \{K_5, K_{3,3}\}$. By Lemma 4.1, a graph G belongs to $\mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g})$ if only if $\widehat{G} \in \mathcal{E}$. Since $xy \notin E(G)$, $\widehat{G}$ is not isomorphic to K_5 and thus $\mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g})$ consists of the unique graph isomorphic to $K_{3,3}$ with two non-adjacent terminals.

Let us show first that each graph in Fig. 1 belongs to $\mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g^+})$. If $\widehat{G^+}$ is isomorphic to a Kuratowski graph, then $G \in \mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g^+})$ by Lemma 4.2. Otherwise $\widehat{G}$ is isomorphic to $K_{3,3}$ with x and y non-adjacent. It suffices to show that μG^+ is planar for each minor-operation $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G)$ as G^+ clearly embeds into the projective plane. Pick an arbitrary edge $e \in E(G)$. The graph $G^+ - e$ has 9 edges and is not isomorphic to $K_{3,3}$ as it contains a triangle. The graph G^+/e has only 5 vertices and (at most) 9 edges. Since e was arbitrary, it follows that μG^+ is planar for every $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G)$. We conclude that $G \in \mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g^+})$.

We shall show now that there are no other graphs in $\mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g^+})$. Let $G \in \mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g^+})$. By Lemma 4.3, there is a graph $H \in \text{Forb}^*(\mathbb{S}_0)$ such that either $\widehat{G}$ is isomorphic to H or G is isomorphic to the graph obtained from H by deleting an edge and making the ends terminals. It is not hard to see that this yields precisely the graphs in Fig. 1. □

Note that the first two graphs in Fig. 1 have θ equal to 1 and the last one has θ equal to 0. We summarize the properties of graphs in $\mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g^+})$ in the following lemma.

Lemma 5.2. *For every $G \in \mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g^+})$, G/xy is planar, $\theta(G) \leq 1$, and $\theta(G) = 1$ if and only if $G \notin \mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g})$.*

Let us now consider the classes $\mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g})$ and $\mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g^+})$. Since a graph embeds into the projective plane if and only if it has Euler genus at most 1, we have that $\mathcal{E}_1 = \text{Forb}(\mathbb{N}_1)$. Lemma 4.1 says that $\mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g})$ can be constructed from the graphs G in $\mathcal{E}_1$ with $\widehat{g}(G) = 2$ by choosing two nonadjacent vertices as terminals. Actually, each graph $G \in \mathcal{E}_1$ has $\widehat{g}(G) = 2$. This

construction yields 195 (labeled) graphs in $\mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g})$ and confirms that the list is complete. Note that while there are 35 graphs in $\mathcal{E}_1$, the class $\mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g})$ is larger because graphs in $\mathcal{G}_{xy}$ have two labeled terminals.

Lemma 4.3 provides a mean for constructing the class $\mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$. We construct a slightly larger class and then test which of the obtained graphs are in $\mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$. Let $G \in \mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$. If $\theta(G) = 0$, then $G \in \mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g})$ and thus $\widehat{G} \in \mathcal{E}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{E}_1^*$. If $\theta(G) > 0$, then $\widehat{G^+} \in \mathcal{E}_1^*$. The class $\mathcal{E}_1^*$ contains 103 graphs (see [1]). Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the class of graphs with terminals obtained from $\mathcal{E}_1^*$ by either making two nonadjacent vertices terminals or deleting an edge e and making the ends of e terminals. By Lemma 4.3, we have that $\mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}^+) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$. In order to construct $\mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$, it is sufficient to check which graphs G in $\mathcal{A}$ are minor-minimal graphs such that G^+ does not embed into the projective plane. This construction gives 250 such graphs, out of which only 227 graphs have G^+ 2-connected. The intersection $\mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}) \cap \mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$ contains 95 graphs, so we have 132 graphs in $\mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}^+) \setminus \mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g})$.

The class $\mathcal{S}_1$ is determined in Sect. 9 and 10 and shown to contain 21 graphs (and all have G^+ 2-connected).

By considering all 348 graphs in $\mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}) \cup \mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \mathcal{S}_1$, we obtained the following result by using computer.

Lemma 5.3. *For every $G \in \mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}) \cup \mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \mathcal{S}_1$, the graph G^+ embeds into the Klein bottle.*

To prove Lemma 5.3, it is sufficient to provide an embedding of $\widehat{G^+}$ in the Klein bottle for each $G \in \mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}) \cup \mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \mathcal{S}_1$. The graphs and their embeddings in the Klein bottle are available online[3]. Based on this evidence, we obtain the following properties of graphs in $\mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g})$.

Lemma 5.4. *For every $G \in \mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g})$, we have that $\theta(G) = 0$ and $\Delta_2(\widehat{g}) \subseteq \Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 5.3, $\widehat{g}^+(G) = \widehat{g}(G^+) \leq 2$. Since $\widehat{g}(G) = 2$, we have that $\theta(G) = \widehat{g}^+(G) - \widehat{g}(G) = 0$.

The claim that $\Delta_2(\widehat{g}) \subseteq \Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+)$ was checked by computer. It is enough to show that for each $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G)$ such that μG is planar, the graph μG^+ is projective planar. □

The class of hoppers is mysterious. Although we were not able to construct any, we believe that they appear when the genus is large. However, there are none when genus is small.

Lemma 5.5. *The classes $\mathcal{H}_1^{\mathrm{w}}(\widehat{g}), \mathcal{H}_1^{\mathrm{w}}(\widehat{g}^+)$, $\mathcal{H}_1(\widehat{g})$, and $\mathcal{H}_1(\widehat{g}^+)$ are empty.*

Proof. Let $G \in \mathcal{H}_1(\widehat{g})$. Since G is non-planar, it has a Kuratowski graph K as a minor. Since $\widehat{g}(G) = 2$, K is a proper minor of G. Hence there is a minor-operation $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G)$ such that μG still has K as a minor. Thus $\widehat{g}(\mu G) \geq \widehat{g}(K) = 1$. We conclude that $\mu \notin \Delta_2(\widehat{g})$, a contradiction.

Similarly, let $G \in \mathcal{H}_1(\widehat{g}^+)$. Then $\widehat{g}(G^+) = 2$, and thus there is a Kuratowski graph K that is a proper minor of G^+. Thus there is a minor-operation $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\widehat{G^+})$ such that $\widehat{\mu G^+}$ has K

[3]Embeddings of G^+ in the Klein bottle for every $G \in \mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}) \cup \mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \mathcal{S}_1$ are listed at `***arxiv.com`

$\eta(G_1, G_2)$	G_1
0	$\mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$
1	$\mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$
2	$\mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}) \cup \mathcal{S}$

Table 4: Classification of $\widehat{g}$-tight parts of a 2-sum in $\mathcal{C}_2^\circ(\widehat{g})$.

as a minor. Furthermore, since $\widehat{g}(K+uv) = 1$ for all $u, v \in V(G)$ by Lemma 5.1, we may pick μ that does not delete nor contract xy. Thus $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G)$. We have that $\widehat{g}^+(\mu G) \geq \widehat{g}(K) = 1$, a contradiction.

Let $G \in \mathcal{H}_1^{\mathrm{w}}(\widehat{g}^+)$. Thus $\widehat{g}^+(G) = 2$ and $\theta(G) = 2$. Since $\widehat{g}(G) = 0$, we have that $\Delta_1(\widehat{g}) = \emptyset$. We conclude that $\mathcal{M}(G) = \Delta_2(\widehat{g}^+)$. Hence $G \in \mathcal{H}_1(\widehat{g}^+)$ which was already shown to be empty.

Let $G \in \mathcal{H}_1^{\mathrm{w}}(\widehat{g})$. Thus $\widehat{g}^+(G) = 2$, $\theta(G) = 0$, and $G \in \mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g})$. By Lemma 5.4, $\mathcal{M}(G) = \Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+)$. Thus $G \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$, a contradiction. □

Let us now state some properties of the parts of xy-sums in $\mathcal{C}_2^\circ(\widehat{g})$ and $\mathcal{C}_2^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$.

Lemma 5.6. *Let G be the xy-sum of connected graphs $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_{xy}^\circ$ such that $\widehat{g}^+(G_1) \leq \widehat{g}^+(G_2)$. If $G \in \mathcal{C}_2^\circ(\widehat{g})$, then*

(i) $\widehat{g}^+(G_1) = 1$,

(ii) $\widehat{g}^+(G_2) = 2$,

(iii) $\eta(G_1, G_2) \leq 2$.

Proof. If $\widehat{g}^+(G_2) > 2$, then since G_2^+ is a proper minor of G, there is a minor-operation $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G)$ such that $\widehat{g}(\mu G) \geq \widehat{g}(G_2^+) > 2$, a contradiction. Thus $\widehat{g}^+(G_2) \leq 2$. If $\widehat{g}^+(G_1) = 0$, then $\widehat{g}(G) \leq \widehat{h}_1(G) = \widehat{g}^+(G_1) + \widehat{g}^+(G_2) \leq 2$ by Theorem 3.2, a contradiction. Hence $\widehat{g}^+(G_1) \geq 1$.

By Theorem 3.2, we have

$$\widehat{h}_1(G) = \widehat{g}^+(G_1) + \widehat{g}^+(G_2) \geq \widehat{g}(G) = 3.$$

This implies that $\widehat{g}^+(G_2) = 2$ and (ii) holds. We also have

$$\widehat{h}_0(G) = \widehat{g}(G_1) + \widehat{g}(G_2) + 2 \geq \widehat{g}(G) = 3.$$

Therefore, $\widehat{g}(G_1) + \widehat{g}(G_2) \geq 1$.

Suppose that $\widehat{g}^+(G_1) = 2$. If $\widehat{g}(G_1) + \widehat{g}(G_2) \geq 2$, then by Theorem 3.2,

$$\widehat{g}(G) = \min\{\widehat{h}_0(G), \widehat{h}_1(G)\} = 4,$$

a contradiction with $\widehat{g}(G) = 3$. Hence $\widehat{g}(G_1) + \widehat{g}(G_2) = 1$. Since $\widehat{g}^+(G_1) = \widehat{g}^+(G_2)$, we may exchange the roles of G_1 and G_2 if necessary and thus assume that $\widehat{g}(G_1) = 0$. By Lemma 5.5,

$\mathcal{H}_1(\widehat{g}^+) = \emptyset$ and thus there exists a minor-operation $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G_1)$ such that $\widehat{g}^+(\mu G_1) \geq 1$. Note that $\widehat{g}(\mu G_1) = 0$. By Theorem 3.2,

$$\widehat{g}(\mu G) = \min\{\widehat{h}_0(\mu G), \widehat{h}_1(\mu G)\} = \min\{\widehat{g}(\mu G_1) + \widehat{g}(G_2) + 2, \widehat{g}^+(\mu G_1) + \widehat{g}^+(G_2)\} = 3,$$

a contradiction with $G \in \mathcal{C}_2^\circ(\widehat{g})$. We conclude that $\widehat{g}^+(G_1) = 1$ and (i) holds. Since $\widehat{g}(G_1) + \widehat{g}(G_2) \geq 1$ and $\widehat{g}^+(G_1) + \widehat{g}^+(G_2) = 3$, we have that $\eta(G_1, G_2) \leq 2$ and (iii) holds. □

Lemma 5.7. *Let G be the xy-sum of connected graphs $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_{xy}^\circ$ such that $\widehat{g}^+(G_1) \leq \widehat{g}^+(G_2)$. If $G \in \mathcal{C}_2^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$, then*

(i) $\widehat{g}^+(G_1) = 1$,

(ii) $\widehat{g}^+(G_2) = 2$.

Proof. If $\widehat{g}^+(G_2) > 2$, then, since G_2 is a proper minor of G, there is a minor-operation $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G_1)$,such that μG still has G_2 as a minor. Hence $\widehat{g}^+(\mu G) \geq \widehat{g}^+(G_2) > 2$. We conclude that $\widehat{g}^+(G) = \widehat{g}^+(\mu G) = 3$, a contradiction. This shows that $\widehat{g}^+(G_2) \leq 2$.

By Theorem 3.2, we have

$$3 = \widehat{g}^+(G) = \widehat{h}_1(G) = \widehat{g}^+(G_1) + \widehat{g}^+(G_2).$$

Since $\widehat{g}^+(G_2) \leq 2$, we conclude that $\widehat{g}^+(G_1) = 1$ and $\widehat{g}^+(G_2) = 2$. Thus (i) and (ii) hold. □

Finally, we are ready to state a theorem which classifies the xy-sums in $\mathcal{C}_2^\circ(\widehat{g})$.

Theorem 5.8. *Let G be the xy-sum of connected graphs $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_{xy}^\circ$. If the following statements* (i)–(iv) *hold, then $G \in \mathcal{C}_2^\circ(\widehat{g})$.*

(i) $G_1 \in \mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$.

(ii) $G_2 \in \mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \mathcal{S}_1$.

(iii) *If $G_1 \in \mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g})$, then $G_2 \in \mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$.*

(iv) *If $G_1 \notin \mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g})$, then $\theta(G_2) \leq 1$.*

Conversely, every 2-connected graph $G \in \mathcal{C}_2^\circ(\widehat{g})$ such that $\{x, y\}$ is a 2-vertex-cut can be obtained in this way.

Proof. Suppose that statements (i)–(iv) hold. Our goal is to show that $G \in \mathcal{C}_2^\circ(\widehat{g})$. By Lemma 3.1, it is enough to prove that G_1 and G_2 are $\widehat{g}$-tight in G and that $\widehat{g}(G) = 3$. If $G_1 \in \mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g})$, then $\theta(G_1) = 0$ by Lemma 5.2. Otherwise, $\theta(G_1) = 1$ and $\theta(G_2) \leq 1$ by (iv). We conclude that in both cases we have $\eta(G_1, G_2) \leq 2$. Theorem 4.8 and (i) give that G_1 is $\widehat{g}$-tight in G. If $\eta(G_1, G_2) = 2$, then G_2 is $\widehat{g}$-tight in G by Theorem 4.8 and (ii). Suppose now that $\eta(G_1, G_2) \leq 1$ and $G_2 \in \mathcal{S}_1$. Since $\theta(G_2) = 1$ by Lemma 4.4, we have that $\theta(G_1) = 0$ and hence $G_1 \in \mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g})$ by Lemma 5.2. This is a contradiction with (iii). Thus, we may

assume that $G_2 \in \mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$. Theorem 4.8 asserts that G_2 is $\widehat{g}$-tight in G. Since $\eta(G_1, G_2) \leq 2$, $\widehat{g}^+(G_1) = 1$, and $\widehat{g}^+(G_2) = 2$, Theorem 3.2 and (5) give that

$$\widehat{g}(G) = \widehat{h}_1(G) = \widehat{g}^+(G_1) + \widehat{g}^+(G_2) = 3.$$

Therefore, $G \in \mathcal{C}_2^\circ(\widehat{g})$.

We shall now show the converse, that is, for $G \in \mathcal{C}_2^\circ(\widehat{g})$ where $\{x, y\}$ is a 2-vertex-cut, we find connected graphs $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_{xy}^\circ$ such that G is an xy-sum of G_1 and G_2 and (i)–(iv) hold. Let us distribute the $\{x, y\}$-bridges arbitrarily into G_1 and G_2 so that $\widehat{g}^+(G_1) \leq \widehat{g}^+(G_2)$ and G_1, G_2 contain at least one of the bridges. By Lemma 5.6, we have that $\widehat{g}^+(G_1) = 1$, $\widehat{g}^+(G_2) = 2$, and $\eta(G_1, G_2) \leq 2$. Since $\mathcal{H}_0^{\mathrm{w}}(\widehat{g})$ and $\mathcal{S}_0$ are empty (see Lemma 4.4), Theorem 4.8 gives that $G_1 \in \mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g}) \cup \mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g}^+) = \mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$. Thus (i) holds.

Since $\eta(G_1, G_2) \leq 2$, $G_2 \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}) \cup \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{w}}(\widehat{g})$ by Theorem 4.8. By Lemma 5.5, $\mathcal{H}_1^{\mathrm{w}}(\widehat{g})$ is empty. Since $\widehat{g}^+(G_2) = 2$, we have that $G_2 \notin \mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g}) \cup \mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$. We conclude that $G_2 \in \mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}) \cup \mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \mathcal{S}_1$. Assume for a contradiction that $G_2 \in \mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}) \setminus \mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$. Thus there exists a minor-operation $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G_2)$ such that $\mu \notin \Delta_2(\widehat{g}) \cup \Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+)$ since $\mathcal{H}_1^{\mathrm{w}}(\widehat{g})$ is empty. By (2), $\widehat{h}_1(\mu G) = \widehat{h}_1(G)$. Since G_2 is $\widehat{g}$-tight in G, Theorem 3.2 gives:

$$3 = \widehat{g}(G) > \widehat{g}(\mu G) = \widehat{h}_0(\mu G) = \widehat{g}(G_1) + \widehat{g}(\mu G_2) + 2 \geq 3.$$

This contradicts our assumption that $G_2 \notin \mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \mathcal{S}_1$. We conclude that (ii) holds.

Suppose that $G_1 \in \mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g})$ and $G_2 \in \mathcal{S}_1$. Since $\theta(G_1) = 0$ and $\theta(G_2) = 1$ by Lemmas 4.4 and 5.2, we have that $\eta(G_1, G_2) = 1$. This contradicts Theorem 4.8. Thus (iii) holds.

In order to show (iv), suppose that $G_1 \notin \mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g})$ and $\theta(G_2) = 2$. Then $\theta(G_1) = 1$ by Lemma 5.2 and thus $\eta(G_1, G_2) = 3$. This contradicts Lemma 5.6(iii). We conclude that (iv) holds. □

We also have a corresponding theorem that classifies the xy-sums in $\mathcal{C}_2^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$.

Theorem 5.9. *Let G be the xy-sum of connected graphs $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_{xy}^\circ$. If the following statements (i) and (ii) hold, then $G \in \mathcal{C}_2^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$.*

(i) $G_1 \in \mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$.

(ii) $G_2 \in \mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$.

Conversely, every 2-connected graph $G \in \mathcal{C}_2^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$ such that $\{x, y\}$ is a 2-vertex-cut can be obtained this way.

Proof. Suppose that (i) and (ii) hold. By Theorem 4.9, G_1 and G_2 are $\widehat{g}^+$-tight in G. Thus $G \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$ by Lemma 3.1. By Theorem 3.2,

$$\widehat{g}^+(G) = \widehat{h}_1(G) = \widehat{g}^+(G_1) + \widehat{g}^+(G_2) = 3.$$

Therefore, $G \in \mathcal{C}_2^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$.

For the converse, let G_1 and G_2 be collections of $\{x,y\}$-bridges in G such that G is the xy-sum of G_1 and G_2, $\widehat{g}^+(G_1) \leq \widehat{g}^+(G_2)$, and G_1, G_2 contain at least one of the bridges. We shall show that (i) and (ii) hold. By Theorem 4.9, $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$. By Lemma 5.7, $\widehat{g}^+(G_1) = 1$ and $\widehat{g}^+(G_2) = 2$. We conclude that $G_1 \in \mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$ and $G_2 \in \mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$ and thus (i) and (ii) hold. □

The following lemma gives necessary and sufficient conditions for the edge xy to be $\widehat{g}$-tight in a graph with a 2-vertex-cut $\{x,y\}$ and the edge xy.

Lemma 5.10. *Let G be an xy-sum of connected graphs $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_{xy}^\circ$ and let $H = \widehat{G^+}$. Then the subgraph of H consisting of the edge xy is $\widehat{g}$-tight in H if and only if $\eta(G_1,G_2) > 2$ and either $\widehat{g}(G_1/xy) < \widehat{g}^+(G_1)$ or $\widehat{g}(G_2/xy) < \widehat{g}^+(G_2)$,*

Proof. Since $\widehat{g}(H) = \widehat{g}^+(G) = \widehat{g}(G) + \theta(G)$ and $\widehat{g}(H-xy) = \widehat{g}(G)$, we have that $\widehat{g}(H-xy) < \widehat{g}(H)$ if and only if $\theta(G) > 0$. Theorem 3.2 gives that $\theta(G) > 0$ if and only if $\eta(G_1,G_2) > 2$. Thus we may assume below that $\eta(G_1,G_2) > 2$.

By Theorem 2.2, $\widehat{g}(H/xy) = \widehat{g}(G_1/xy) + \widehat{g}(G_2/xy)$. Since $\widehat{g}(G_1/xy) \leq \widehat{g}^+(G_1)$ and $\widehat{g}(G_2/xy) \leq \widehat{g}^+(G_2)$, we have that $\widehat{g}(H/xy) < \widehat{g}(H)$ if and only if either $\widehat{g}(G_1/xy) < \widehat{g}^+(G_1)$ or $\widehat{g}(G_2/xy) < \widehat{g}^+(G_2)$. □

We conclude this section by characterizing the graphs of connectivity 2 in $\mathcal{E}_2$.

Theorem 5.11. *Let G be an xy-sum of connected graphs $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_{xy}^\circ$ such that the following holds:*

(i) $G_1 \in \mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$.

(ii) $G_2 \in \mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \mathcal{S}_1$.

(iii) *If $G_1 \in \mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g})$, then $G_2 \in \mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$.*

If $\eta(G_1,G_2) \leq 2$, then $\widehat{G} \in \mathcal{E}_2$. If $\eta(G_1,G_2) > 2$, then $\widehat{G^+} \in \mathcal{E}_2$. Furthermore, each graph in $\mathcal{E}_2$ of connectivity 2 is constructed this way.

Proof. Assume first that $\eta(G_1,G_2) \leq 2$. By Lemma 4.1, it is sufficient to show that G_1 and G_2 satisfy the conditions (i)–(iv) of Theorem 5.8. The conditions (i)–(iii) of Theorem 5.8 are the same as the assumptions of this theorem. If $G_1 \notin \mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g})$, then $\theta(G_1) = 1$ by Lemma 5.2. Since $\eta(G_1,G_2) \leq 2$, we have that $\theta(G_2) \leq 1$ and (iv) holds. By Theorem 5.8, $G \in \mathcal{C}_2^\circ(\widehat{g})$. By Lemma 4.1, $\widehat{G} \in \mathcal{E}_2$.

Assume now that $\eta(G_1,G_2) > 2$. Since, for each graph $G \in \mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \mathcal{S}_1$, $\theta(G) \leq 1$, by Lemmas 4.4 and 5.2, we conclude that $\eta(G_1,G_2) = 3$, $\theta(G_1) = 1$, $\theta(G_2) = 2$, $G_1 \notin \mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g})$, and $G_2 \in \mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$. By Theorem 5.9, $G \in \mathcal{C}_2^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$. Note that this implies that $\widehat{G}$ is $\widehat{g}$-tight in $\widehat{G^+}$. Since $\widehat{g}^+(G_1/xy) < \widehat{g}^+(G_1)$ (Lemma 5.2), we obtain that xy is $\widehat{g}$-tight in $\widehat{G^+}$ by Lemma 5.10. Since $\widehat{g}(\widehat{G^+}) = \widehat{g}^+(G) = 3$, $\widehat{G^+} \in \mathcal{E}_2$ by Lemma 3.1.

Let us now prove that each $H \in \mathcal{E}_2$ of connectivity 2 is constructed this way. Pick an arbitrary 2-vertex-cut $\{x,y\}$ of H. Suppose first that $xy \in E(H)$. Consider $G = H - xy$ as a

graph in $\mathcal{G}^\circ_{xy}$. Since $\mathcal{M}(G) \subseteq \mathcal{M}(H)$, we have that $\mathcal{M}(G) = \Delta_1(\widehat{g}^+)$ and $G \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$. Suppose that $\widehat{g}^+(G) > 3$. Let G_1 and G_2 be parts of G such that $\widehat{g}^+(G_1) \leq \widehat{g}^+(G_2)$. If $\widehat{g}^+(G_2) > 2$, then for any minor-operation $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G_1)$, the graph μG has G_2^+ as a minor. Hence $\widehat{g}(\mu H) \geq \widehat{g}^+(G_2) > 2$, a contradiction. Therefore, $\widehat{g}^+(G_2) \leq 2$. By Theorem 3.2, $\widehat{g}^+(G_1) = \widehat{g}^+(G_2) = 2$. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G_1)$. By Theorem 3.2, $2 \geq \widehat{g}(\mu H) = \widehat{g}^+(\mu G) = \widehat{g}^+(\mu G_1) + \widehat{g}^+(G_2)$. Hence $\widehat{g}^+(\mu G_1) = 0$. We conclude that $\mathcal{M}(G_1) = \Delta_2(\widehat{g}^+)$ and $G_1 \in \mathcal{H}_1(\widehat{g}^+)$. By Lemma 5.5, $\mathcal{H}_1(\widehat{g}^+)$ is empty, a contradiction.

So we may assume that $\widehat{g}^+(G) = 3$ and thus $G \in \mathcal{C}^\circ_2(\widehat{g}^+)$. By Theorem 5.9, G is an xy-sum of graphs $G_1 \in \mathcal{C}^\circ_0(\widehat{g}^+)$ and $G_2 \in \mathcal{C}^\circ_1(\widehat{g}^+)$. By Lemma 5.10, $\eta(G_1, G_2) > 2$. Thus G satisfies the conditions (i)–(iii) of the theorem.

Suppose now that $xy \notin E(H)$. Consider $G = H$ as a graph in $\mathcal{G}^\circ_{xy}$. By Lemma 4.1, $G \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g})$. Suppose that $\widehat{g}(G) > 3$. Let G_1 and G_2 be parts of G such that $\widehat{g}^+(G_1) \leq \widehat{g}^+(G_2)$. If $\widehat{g}^+(G_2) > 2$, then for any minor-operation $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G_1)$ so that μG_1 is connected, the graph μG has G_2^+ as a minor. Hence $\widehat{g}(\mu H) \geq \widehat{g}^+(G_2) > 2$, a contradiction. Therefore, $\widehat{g}^+(G_2) \leq 2$. By Theorem 3.2, $\widehat{g}^+(G_1) = \widehat{g}^+(G_2) = 2$ and $3 < \widehat{g}(G) \leq \widehat{h}_0(G) = \widehat{g}(G_1) + \widehat{g}(G_2) + 2$. We may assume that $\widehat{g}(G_1) \leq \widehat{g}(G_2)$ and so $\widehat{g}(G_2) \geq 1$. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G_1)$. By Theorem 3.2,

$$2 \geq \widehat{g}(\mu H) = \widehat{g}(\mu G) = \min\{\widehat{h}_0(\mu G), \widehat{h}_1(\mu G)\}.$$

Since $\widehat{h}_0(\mu G) = \widehat{g}(\mu G_1) + \widehat{g}(G_2) + 2 \geq 3$, we have that $2 \geq \widehat{h}_1(\mu G) = \widehat{g}^+(\mu G_1) + \widehat{g}^+(G_2)$. We conclude that $\widehat{g}^+(\mu G_1) = 0$ and $\mu \in \Delta_2(\widehat{g}^+)$. Since μ was arbitrary, $G_1 \in \mathcal{H}_1(\widehat{g}^+)$. This contradicts Lemma 5.5 which asserts that $\mathcal{H}_1(\widehat{g}^+)$ is empty.

Thus we may assume that $\widehat{g}(G) = 3$ and thus $G \in \mathcal{C}^\circ_2(\widehat{g})$. By Theorem 5.8, G is an xy-sum of graphs $G_1 \in \mathcal{C}^\circ_0(\widehat{g}^+)$ and $G_2 \in \mathcal{C}^\circ_1(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \mathcal{S}_1$ and either $G_1 \notin \mathcal{C}^\circ_0(\widehat{g})$ or $G_2 \notin \mathcal{S}_1$. If $G_1 \in \mathcal{C}^\circ_0(\widehat{g})$, then $\theta(G_1) = 0$ by Lemma 5.2 and thus $\eta(G_1, G_2) \leq 2$. Otherwise, $\theta(G_1) \leq 1$ and $\theta(G_2) \leq 1$ by Theorem 5.8(iv) and we obtain that $\eta(G_1, G_2) \leq 2$. Thus G satisfies the conditions (i)–(iii) of the theorem. □

As a corollary we can construct the complete list of graphs in $\mathcal{E}_2$ of connectivity 2.

Corollary 5.12. *There are precisely* 668 *graphs of connectivity 2 that are critical for Euler genus 2.*

Proof. Let us begin by counting the number of pairs G_1, G_2 that satisfy the conditions (i)–(iii) of Theorem 5.11. There are 3 graphs in $\mathcal{C}^\circ_0(\widehat{g}^+)$, there are 227 graphs G_2 in $\mathcal{C}^\circ_1(\widehat{g}^+)$ such that G_2^+ is 2-connected, and there are 21 graphs in $\mathcal{S}_1$ (for each $G \in \mathcal{S}_1$, the graph G^+ is 2-connected). That gives 744 pairs since $|\mathcal{C}^\circ_0(\widehat{g})| = 1$ and $|\mathcal{S}_1| = 21$. There are only $744 - 21 = 723$ pairs that satisfy the condition (iii) of Theorem 5.11 that either $G_1 \notin \mathcal{C}^\circ_0(\widehat{g})$ or $G_2 \notin \mathcal{S}_1$.

Let $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}^\circ_{xy}$. There are two xy-sums that have parts isomorphic to G_1 and G_2 as there are two ways how to identify two pairs of vertices. If $G_1 \in \mathcal{C}^\circ_0(\widehat{g}^+)$, then there is an automorphism of G_1 exchanging the terminals. Hence there is only a single non-isomorphic xy-sum G that has parts $G_1 \in \mathcal{C}^\circ_0(\widehat{g}^+)$ and $G_2 \in \mathcal{C}^\circ_1(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \mathcal{S}_1$. Since $\eta(G_1, G_2)$ depends only

on G_1 and G_2, precisely one of $\widehat{G}, \widehat{G^+}$ belongs to $\mathcal{E}_2$. There may be more pairs G_1, G_2 giving the same graph $H \in \mathcal{E}_2$ though.

Let $H \in \mathcal{E}_2$ have connectivity 2. By Theorem 5.11, there exists an xy-sum G of connected graphs G_1 and G_2 such that either $\widehat{G} \cong H$ or $\widehat{G^+} \cong H$. Note that G_1^+ and G_2^+ are 2-connected. Suppose that H admits a nontrivial automorphism ψ such that $\psi(V(G_1)) \neq V(G_1)$ (otherwise, it is just a combination of two automorphisms of G_1 and G_2). It is not hard to see that if G_2^+ is 3-connected, each automorphism of H is trivial. Therefore, we need to study graphs $G_2 \in \mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}^+) \cup \mathcal{S}_1$ such that G_2^+ has connectivity 2.

There are 39 graphs G_2 in $\mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$ such that G_2^+ has connectivity 2 and there are 4 graphs G_2 in $\mathcal{S}_1$ such that G_2^+ has connectivity 2 (see Fig. 6). It is not hard to check that the 125 pairs with $G_1 \in \mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$ make only 70 non-isomorphic graphs in $\mathcal{E}_2$. We conclude that there are 668 graphs of connectivity 2 in $\mathcal{E}_2$. □

6 The Klein bottle

In this section, we characterize the obstructions of connectivity 2 for embedding graphs into the Klein bottle. Let us introduce graph parameters σ and σ^+ that capture the property of being orientably simple. Let $\sigma = \widetilde{g} - \widehat{g}$ and let $\sigma^+ = \widetilde{g}^+ - \widehat{g}^+$. Note that $\sigma(G) = 1$ if G is orientably simple and $\sigma(G) = 0$ otherwise.

The following lemma is an easy consequence of Lemma 2.1.

Lemma 6.1. *If $\widehat{g}^+(G)$ is odd, then $\sigma^+(G) = 0$.*

Let us state the following theorem of Stahl and Beineke using our formalism.

Theorem 6.2 (Stahl and Beineke [13])**.** *Let $G = G_1 \cup G_2$ be a 1-sum of G_1 and G_2. Then*

$$\widetilde{g}(G) = \widehat{g}(G_1) + \widehat{g}(G_2) + \sigma(G_1)\sigma(G_2).$$

Moreover, $\sigma(G) = \sigma(G_1)\sigma(G_2)$.

In order to describe how the nonorientable genus of a 2-sum of graphs can be computed from the genera of its parts, let us introduce parameters $\widetilde{h}_0$ and $\widetilde{h}_1$ similar to $\widehat{h}_0$ and $\widehat{h}_1$. Let G be an xy-sum of connected graphs $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_{xy}$. Define

$$\widetilde{h}_0(G) = \widehat{h}_0(G) = \widehat{g}(G_1) + \widehat{g}(G_2) + 2 \tag{6}$$

and

$$\widetilde{h}_1(G) = \widehat{g}^+(G_1) + \widehat{g}^+(G_2) + \sigma^+(G_1)\sigma^+(G_2). \tag{7}$$

Let $\widetilde{\theta} = \widetilde{g}^+ - \widetilde{g}$. We shall use the following theorem of Richter.

Theorem 6.3 (Richter [10])**.** *Let G be an xy-sum of connected graphs $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_{xy}$. Then*

(i) $\widetilde{g}(G) = \min\{\widetilde{h}_0(G), \widetilde{h}_1(G)\}$,

(ii) $\widetilde{g}^+(G) = \widetilde{h}_1(G)$,

(iii) $\widetilde{\theta}(G) = \max\{\widetilde{h}_1(G) - \widetilde{h}_0(G), 0\}$,

(iv) $\sigma^+(G) = \sigma^+(G_1)\sigma^+(G_2)$, *and*

(v) *if* $\sigma^+(G) = 0$ *or* $\eta(G_1, G_2) \geq 2$, *then* $\sigma(G) = 0$, *else* $\sigma(G) = 1$.

The next lemma shows that the xy-sums of graphs with parts that are not orientably simple are critical graphs for Euler genus if and only if they are obstructions for the corresponding nonorientable surface.

Lemma 6.4. *Let G be an xy-sum of connected graphs $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}^\circ_{xy}$, $H \in \{\widehat{G}, \widehat{G^+}\}$, and $k \geq 0$. If $\sigma^+(G_1) = \sigma^+(G_2) = 0$, then $H \in \mathcal{E}_k$ if and only if $H \in Forb(\mathbb{N}_k)$.*

Proof. By Theorem 6.3(iv) and (v), $\sigma(G) = \sigma^+(G) = \sigma^+(G_1)\sigma^+(G_2) = 0$. Therefore, $\sigma(H) = 0$.

Assume first that $H \in \text{Forb}(\mathbb{N}_k)$. We have that $\widehat{g}(H) = \widetilde{g}(H) > k$. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(H)$. Since $\widehat{g}(\mu H) \leq \widetilde{g}(\mu H) \leq k$ and μ is arbitrary, we have that $H \in \mathcal{E}_k$.

Assume now that $H \in \mathcal{E}_k$. By Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2, $G \in \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g}) \cup \mathcal{C}^\circ(\widehat{g^+})$. We have that $\widetilde{g}(H) = \widehat{g}(H) > k$. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G_1)$. By Lemma 3.6, μG_1 is connected. By Theorem 6.3(iv) and (v), $\sigma(\mu G) = \sigma^+(\mu G) = \sigma^+(\mu G_1)\sigma^+(G_2) = 0$. Therefore, $\sigma(\mu H) = 0$. Hence $\widetilde{g}(\mu H) = \widehat{g}(\mu H) \leq k$. Similarly $\widetilde{g}(\mu H) \leq k$ for $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G_2)$. This shows that $H \in \text{Forb}(\mathbb{N}_k)$ if $H = \widehat{G}$. Assume then that $H = \widehat{G^+}$. It remains to see that after deleting or contracting the edge xy, the graph can be embedded in $\mathbb{N}_k$. Since $\sigma(H - xy) = \sigma(G) = 0$, we have that $\widetilde{g}(H - xy) = \widehat{g}(H - xy) \leq k$. By Theorem 6.2, $\sigma(H/xy) = \sigma(G_1/xy)\sigma(G_2/xy)$. If $\sigma(H/xy) = 0$, then $\widetilde{g}(H/xy) = \widehat{g}(H/xy) \leq k$. So, we are done unless $\sigma(G_1/xy) = \sigma(G_2/xy) = 1$, which we assume henceforth. Since G_1/xy is a minor of $\widehat{G_1^+}$, we have that

$$\widehat{g}(G_1/xy) = \widetilde{g}(G_1/xy) - \sigma(G_1/xy) < \widetilde{g}(G_1/xy) \leq \widetilde{g}(G_1^+) = \widetilde{g}^+(G_1) = \widehat{g}^+(G_1).$$

Similarly, we derive that $\widehat{g}(G_2/xy) < \widehat{g}^+(G_2)$. By Theorems 3.2 and 6.2,

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{g}(H/xy) &\leq \widehat{g}(G_1/xy) + \widehat{g}(G_2/xy) + 1 < \widehat{g}^+(G_1) + \widehat{g}^+(G_2) \\ &= \widehat{g}^+(G) = \widehat{g}(H) = \widetilde{g}(H) \leq k.\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that $H \in \text{Forb}(\mathbb{N}_k)$. □

A corollary of Theorem 5.11 and Lemma 6.4 asserts that the class of obstructions for the Klein bottle having connectivity 2 and the class of critical graphs for Euler genus 2 of connectivity 2 are the same. We can say even more:

Corollary 6.5. *Let H be a graph of connectivity 2. Then $H \in \mathcal{E}_2$ if and only if $H \in Forb(\mathbb{N}_2)$.*

Proof. Assume first that $H \in \mathcal{E}_2$. By Theorem 5.11, there is an xy-sum G of graphs $G_1 \in \mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g^+})$ and $G_2 \in \mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g^+}) \cup \mathcal{S}_1$ such that $H \in \{\widehat{G}, \widehat{G^+}\}$. By Lemma 6.1, $\sigma^+(G_1) = 0$. By Lemma 5.3, $\sigma^+(G_2) = 0$. By Lemma 6.4, $H \in \mathrm{Forb}(\mathbb{N}_2)$.

Assume now that $H \in \mathrm{Forb}(\mathbb{N}_2)$. Let G be an xy-sum of connected graphs $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}_{xy}^\circ$ such that $H \in \{\widehat{G}, \widehat{G^+}\}$. Suppose that $\sigma^+(G_1) = 1$. If $\widehat{g}^+(G_1) \geq 2$, then $\widetilde{g}^+(G_1) \geq 3$ and thus G_1^+ does not embed into $\mathbb{N}_2$. This yields a contradiction as H has G_1^+ as a proper minor. Since $\widehat{g}^+(G_1) > 0$, we conclude that $\widehat{g}^+(G_1) = 1$. By Lemma 6.1, $\sigma^+(G_1) = 0$, a contradiction. Therefore by symmetry, $\sigma^+(G_1) = \sigma^+(G_2) = 0$. By Lemma 6.4, $H \in \mathcal{E}_2$. □

7 Bridges and cycles

In the rest of the paper, we develop framework which we use to determine the class $\mathcal{S}_1$ of cascades of genus 1.

Let H be a subgraph of G. An *H-bridge* B is either an edge in $E(G) \setminus E(H)$ with both ends in H or a connected component C of $G - V(H)$ together with all edges with at least one end in C. In the former case we say that the bridge B is *trivial*. The vertices in $V(B) \cap V(H)$ are the *attachments* of B. We also say that B *attaches* at v, for $v \in V(B) \cap V(H)$. The graph $B^\circ = B - V(H)$ is the *interior* of B. We will use the following lemma (see [6, Prop. 6.1.2.]).

Lemma 7.1. *Let $G_1 \in \mathcal{G}_{xy}^\circ$ be a nontrivial $\{x, y\}$-bridge of a graph G. If G_1^+ is planar, then every embedding of $(G - G_1^\circ)^+$ into a surface can be extended to an embedding of G into the same surface.*

A *branch vertex* in H is a vertex of degree different from 2. A *branch* in H is a path P connecting two branch vertices v_1, v_2 such that all vertices in $V(P) \setminus \{v_1, v_2\}$ have degree 2 in H. An *open branch* is obtained from a branch by removing its endvertices.

A *subdivision* of G is a graph obtained from G by replacing each edge of G by a path of length at least 1. A graph H is *homeomorphic* to G, $H \cong G$, if there is a graph K such that both G and H are isomorphic to subdivisions of K. A *Kuratowski subgraph* in G is a subgraph of G homeomorphic to a *Kuratowski graph*, K_5 or $K_{3,3}$. A *K-graph* in G is a subgraph L of G which is homeomorphic to either K_4 or $K_{2,3}$ such that there is an L-bridge in G that attaches to all four branch vertices of L when $L \cong K_4$ or attaches to all three open branches of L when $L \cong K_{2,3}$. Such an L-bridge is a *principal* L-bridge.

Let C be a cycle in a graph G. Two C-bridges B_1 and B_2 *overlap* if at least one of the following conditions hold:

(i) B_1 and B_2 have three attachments in common;

(ii) C contains distinct vertices v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 that appear in this order on C such that v_1 and v_3 are attachments of B_1 and v_2 and v_4 are attachments of B_2.

In the case (ii), we say that B_1 and B_2 *skew-overlap*. The *overlap graph* $O(G, C)$ of G with respect to C is the graph whose vertex-set consists of the C-bridges in G, and two C-bridges are adjacent in $O(G, C)$ if they overlap.

Let C be a cycle in a graph G. For a C-bridge B in G, the *B-side* of C is the union of all C-bridges at even distance from B in the overlap graph $O(G, C)$. For a vertex $v \in V(G) \setminus V(C)$, the *$v$-side* of C is the B-side of the C-bridge B containing v. Two vertices $u, v \in V(G) \setminus V(C)$ are *separated* by C if the C-bridges containing u and v have odd distance in $O(G, C)$. We also say that C is *(u, v)-separating*.

Let G be a Π-embedded graph with the set $F(\Pi)$ of Π-faces. The *Π-face-distance* $d^*_\Pi(v_1, v_2)$ of $v_1, v_2 \in V(G)$ is the minimum number k such that there exists a sequence u_0, f_0, $u_1, \ldots, u_k, f_k$, u_{k+1} such that $u_0 = v_1$, $u_{k+1} = v_2$, and the face $f_i \in F(\Pi)$ is incident with u_i and u_{i+1}, for $i = 0, \ldots, k$. The *face-distance* $d^*_G(v_1, v_2)$ is the minimum Π-face-distance $d^*_\Pi(v_1, v_2)$ over all planar embeddings Π of G. Note that the face-distance is 0 if and only if the graph $G + v_1v_2$ is planar.

The following result relating number of separating cycles and the face-distance of two vertices shall be used.

Lemma 7.2 (Cabello and Mohar [2], Lemma 5.3)**.** *Let G be a planar graph and $x, y \in V(G)$. Then the maximum number of disjoint (x, y)-separating cycles in G is $d^*_G(x, y)$.*

Let C be a cycle in a Π-embedded graph G and $\mathbb{S}$ the surface where G is 2-cell embedded by Π. The cycle C is *Π-contractible* if C forms a surface-separating curve on $\mathbb{S}$ such that one region of $\mathbb{S} - C$ is homeomorphic to an open disk.

Let P_1, P_2, P_3 be internally disjoint paths connecting vertices u and v in G. If the cycles $P_1 \cup P_2$ and $P_2 \cup P_3$ are Π-contractible, then the cycle $P_1 \cup P_3$ is also Π-contractible (see [6], Proposition 4.3.1). This property is called *3-path-condition*. Let T be a spanning tree of G. A *fundamental cycle* of T is the unique cycle in $T + e$ for an edge $e \in E(G) \setminus E(T)$.

Lemma 7.3. *Let G be a Π-embedded graph, L a K-graph in G, and T a spanning tree of L. Then one of the fundamental cycles of T in L is Π-noncontractible.*

Proof. Suppose that all fundamental cycles of T are Π-contractible. Since fundamental cycles of T generate the cycle space of L, the 3-path-condition gives that each cycle of L is Π-contractible. Thus L separates the surface into three regions when $L \cong K_{3,3}$ and into four regions when $L \cong K_4$. Since L is a K-graph in G, there is a principal L-bridge B in G. But the attachments of B does not lie on a single cycle of L and thus B cannot be embedded into any of the regions — a contradiction. □

Since all cycles are contractible when genus is zero and any two Π-noncontractible cycles on the projective plane intersect, we have the following result.

Lemma 7.4. *Let G be a Π-embedded graph. If G contains two disjoint Π-noncontractible cycles, then $\widehat{g}(\Pi) \geq 2$.*

The next lemma is a simple corollary of Lemmas 7.3 and 7.4.

Lemma 7.5. *If G satisfies one of the following conditions, then $\widehat{g}(G) \geq 2$.*

(i) *G contains two disjoint K-graphs.*

(ii) *G contains a Kuratowski subgraph K and a K-graph L that intersects K in at most one half-open branch of K.*

(iii) *G contains a Kuratowski subgraph K and a K-graph L homeomorphic to $K_{2,3}$ such that K and L intersect in at most one branch P of K, and the ends of P do not lie on the same branch of L.*

Proof. If (i) holds, then the result follows by Lemmas 7.3 and 7.4. Suppose that (ii) holds and that P is the branch of K with ends u and v such that $V(L) \cap V(K) \subseteq V(P) \setminus \{v\}$. The K-graph L' in G obtained from K by deleting u is disjoint from L. The result follows by (i).

Assume now that (iii) holds and that P is the branch of K with ends u and v. Let T be a spanning tree of L such that u and v are its leaves. By Lemma 7.3, there is a fundamental cycle C of T that is Π-noncontractible. Since u and v do not lie on a single branch of L and they have degree 1 in T, we may assume that C does not contain u. Thus, $K - u$ contains a K-graph disjoint from C. The result now follows by Lemmas 7.3 and 7.4. □

8 Disjoint K-graphs in cascades

In this section, we show that for every cascade $G \in \mathcal{S}_1$, the graph G^+ contains two disjoint K-graphs. We need the following property of separating cycles.

Lemma 8.1. *Let G be a planar graph, let $x, y \in V(G)$ be vertices separated by a cycle C, and let H be the x-side of C. Then there exists an (x, y)-separating cycle C' such that $C' \subseteq H \cup C$ and the C'-bridges containing x and y overlap.*

Proof. Pick C' to be an (x, y)-separating cycle in G such that $C' \subseteq H \cup C$ and that the distance in $O(G, C')$ of the C'-bridge B_x containing x and the C'-bridge B_y containing y is minimum. Let H' be the x-side of C' and note that $H' \subseteq H$.

Since C' is (x, y)-separating, B_x and B_y have odd distance d in $O(G, C')$. If $d = 1$, then B_x and B_y overlap. Hence we may assume that $d > 1$. Let B_1, B_2, and B_3 be the C'-bridges at distance 1, 2, and 3, respectively, from B_x on a shortest path from B_x to B_y in $O(G, C')$. Since B_2 and B_x do not overlap, the cycle C' can be decomposed into two segments Q_1 and Q_2 with ends v_1 and v_2 such that Q_1 contains all attachments of B_x and Q_2 contains all attachments of B_2. Furthermore, we can assume that v_1 and v_2 are attachments of B_2. Let P be a path in B_2 connecting v_1, v_2 and let C'' be the cycle $Q_1 \cup P$. Let B be a C'-bridge. If B attaches to the interior of Q_2, then B is a subgraph of a single C''-bridge B_0 containing Q_2. Note that this is the case for B_1 and B_3 since they C'-overlap with B_2. If B does not attach to the interior of Q_2 it has the same attachments on C'' as on C'. Since B_1 only attaches to Q_1, we obtain that B_1 overlaps with B_0. It is not hard to see that B_1 and the C''-bridge containing y have distance at most $d - 2$ in $O(G, C'')$. Since $C'' \subseteq H' \cup C'$, we conclude that $C'' \subseteq H \cup C$. This contradicts the choice of C'. □

If $G \in \mathcal{G}^\circ_{xy}$, then a *pre-K-graph* in G is a subgraph of G homeomorphic to either K_4 or $K_{2,3}$ that is a K-graph in G^+. Separating cycles allow us to construct pre-K-graphs on each side of the cycle.

Lemma 8.2. *Let C be an (x,y)-separating cycle in a planar graph $G \in \mathcal{G}^{\circ}_{xy}$ and let B_x and B_y be overlapping C-bridges containing x and y, respectively. Then G contains a pre-K-graph in $C \cup B_x$.*

Proof. Assume first that B_x and B_y skew-overlap and let u_1, v_1 be attachments of B_x and u_2, v_2 be attachments of B_y such that u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2 appear on C in this order. Let P be a path connecting u_1 and v_1 in B_x. We see that $P \cup C$ is a pre-K-graph in G.

Assume now that B_x and B_y do not skew-overlap. Hence B_x and B_y have three attachments u_1, u_2, u_3 in common. Let P_1, P_2, P_3 be internally disjoint paths in B_x with one common end u and with the other ends being u_1, u_2, u_3, respectively. Let P be a (possibly trivial) path connecting x and $P_1 \cup P_2 \cup P_3$ in $B_x - C$ and let v be the other end of P. If $v = u$, then $C \cup P_1 \cup P_2 \cup P_3$ is a pre-K-graph in G. If $v \in V(P_1) \setminus \{u\}$, then let C' be the segment of C with ends u_2 and u_3 that contains u_1. We have that $C' \cup P_1 \cup P_2 \cup P_3$ is a pre-K-graph in G homeomorphic to $K_{2,3}$ with branch vertices u and u_1. We construct a pre-K-graph similarly if $v \in (V(P_2) \cup V(P_3)) \setminus \{u\}$. □

We have the following corollary.

Corollary 8.3. *Let G be a planar graph in $\mathcal{G}^{\circ}_{xy}$. If $d^*_G(x,y) \geq 2$, then G contains two disjoint pre-K-graphs.*

Proof. By Lemma 7.2, there are two disjoint (x,y)-separating cycles C_1 and C_2 in G. Let C_1 and C_2 be such that the x-side of C_1 and the y-side of C_2 are disjoint. By Lemma 8.1, there is an (x,y)-separating cycle C'_1 such that the C'_1-bridges containing x and y overlap. Similarly, there is an (x,y)-separating cycle C'_2 such that the C'_2-bridges containing x and y overlap. Furthermore, we can pick C'_1 and C'_2 so that C'_1 is contained in the x-side of C_1 and C'_2 in the y-side of C_2. Therefore, C'_1 and C'_2 are disjoint. Let B_x be the C'_1-bridge containing x and let B_y be the C'_2-bridge containing y. By Lemma 8.2, the graph G contains a pre-K-graph in $C'_1 \cup B_x$ and a pre-K-graph in $C'_2 \cup B_y$. Thus, G contains two disjoint pre-K-graphs. □

The following lemma relates the face-distance of x and y in a planar graph $G \in \mathcal{G}^{\circ}_{xy}$ to the genus of G^+.

Lemma 8.4. *Let $G \in \mathcal{G}^{\circ}_{xy}$ be a planar graph and $d^* = d^*_G(x,y)$. If $d^* \leq 2$, then $\widehat{g}^+(G) = d^*$. If $d^* \geq 3$, then $\widehat{g}^+(G) = 2$.*

Proof. Suppose first that there exists a planar embedding Π of G where $d^*_\Pi(x,y) \leq 1$. If $d^*_\Pi(x,y) = 0$, then G^+ is planar and $\widehat{g}^+(G) = 0$. Suppose then that $d^*_\Pi(x,y) = 1$. Then there exists a vertex $v \in V(G)$ and two Π-faces f_1, f_2 incident with v such that f_1 is incident with x and f_2 is incident with y. Let $e_1 v e_2$ be a Π-angle of f_1 and $e_3 v e_4$ a Π-angle of f_2. We can write the local rotation around v as $e_2, S_1, e_3, e_4, S_2, e_1$. Let us construct the following embedding Π' of G^+ in the projective plane. Let $\Pi'(u) = \Pi(u)$ for each $u \in V(G) \setminus \{x, y, v\}$. To obtain $\Pi'(x)$, insert the edge xy into the local rotation $\Pi(x)$ of x between the edges e'_1, e'_2 where e'_1, x, e'_2 is a Π-angle of f_1. The local rotation $\Pi'(y)$ of y is obtained analogously. Let $\Pi'(v) =$

$e_2, S_2, e_3, e_1, S_2^{\mathrm{R}}, e_4$, where S_2^{R} is the reverse of S_2. Let $\Pi'(e) = -1$, if $e \in \{xy, e_1, e_4\} \cup S_2$, and $\Pi'(e) = 1$ otherwise. We leave it to the reader to check that Π' is indeed an embedding of G^+ into the projective plane. Thus $\widehat{g}^+(G) \leq 1$ as claimed.

Assume now that $d^*_G(x, y) \geq 2$. By Corollary 8.3, G^+ contains two disjoint K-graphs. By Lemma 7.5(i), $\widehat{g}(G^+) = \widehat{g}^+(G) \geq 2$. However, adding an edge increases Euler genus by at most 2, so $\widehat{g}^+(G) = 2$. □

A pre-K-graph L in a planar graph $G \in \mathcal{G}^\circ_{xy}$ is a *z-K-graph* for a terminal $z \in \{x, y\}$ if $z \in V(L)$ and, if $L \cong K_4$, then z is a branch vertex of L, and, if $L \cong K_{2,3}$, then z lies on an open branch of L. The *boundary* of L is the cycle of L that consists of all branches of L that are not incident with z. All vertices and edges of L that do not lie on the boundary of L are said to be in the *interior* of L. A graph $G \in \mathcal{G}^\circ_{xy}$ contains *disjoint xy-K-graphs* if it contains an x-K-graph and a y-K-graph that are disjoint. We conclude this section by showing that each graph in $\mathcal{S}_1$ contains disjoint xy-K-graphs.

Lemma 8.5. *Each graph in $\mathcal{S}_1$ contains disjoint xy-K-graphs.*

Proof. Let $G \in \mathcal{S}_1$. By (C1) and (C3) from the definition of cascades, there is a minor-operation $\mu \in M(G)$ such that μG is planar but $\widehat{g}^+(\mu G) = 2$. By Lemma 8.4, $d^*_{\mu G}(x, y) \geq 2$. Minor operations cannot increase the face-distance. Thus, $d^*_G(x, y) \geq 2$. By Corollary 8.3 and its proof, G contains disjoint (x, y)-separating cycles C'_1, C'_2 and disjoint pre-K-graphs $L_x \subseteq C'_1 \cup B_x$ and $L_y \subseteq C'_2 \cup B_y$ (where B_x is the C'_1-bridge containing x and B_y is the C'_2-bridge containing y such that $B_x \cap B_y = \emptyset$).

Suppose that $x \notin L_x$. Then x has a neighbor $v \in V(B_x) \backslash V(C'_1)$. Consider contracting the edge xv. Since L_x and L_y are disjoint pre-K-graphs in G/xv, we have that $\widehat{g}^+(G/xv) \geq 2$. By (C1), G/xv is planar. Since B_x/xv has the same attachments on C'_1 as B_x and G is nonplanar, we conclude that $C'_1 \cup B_x$ is nonplanar and thus contains a Kuratowski subgraph K. Let e be an edge of G joining a vertex on C'_1 with a vertex that is not in $C'_1 \cup B_x$. Observe that L_y is a pre-K-graph in G/e. In the graph G/e, K shares at most one vertex with L_y. By Lemma 7.5(ii), $\widehat{g}^+(G/e) \geq 2$. Since G/e contains K, $\widehat{g}(G/e) \geq 1$, a contradiction with (C1). We conclude that $x \in L_x$. By symmetry $y \in L_y$. Therefore, G contains disjoint xy-K-graphs. □

9 The class $\mathcal{S}_1$

Throughout this section we will use the following notation and assumptions. Let us consider a graph $G \in \mathcal{S}_1$. By Lemma 8.5, G contains an x-K-graph L_x and a y-K-graph L_y that are disjoint. We shall assume that L_x is *minimal* in the sense that there is no x-K-graph properly contained in L_x. Similarly take L_y minimal. Let B_y be the L_x-bridge in G that contains L_y. Define B_x similarly. A *base* in G is a subgraph H of G such that H contains L_x and L_y and they are pre-K-graphs in H. In this section, we use the structure obtained in the previous section to construct cascades in $\mathcal{S}_1$ and find their planar bases.

Each graph $G \in \mathcal{S}_1$ has $\widehat{g}^+(G) = 2$, and thus contains a graph $H \in \mathcal{C}^\circ_1(\widehat{g}^+)$ as a minor. The next lemma shows that H has to be planar.



Figure 2: The planar graphs in $\mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$.

Lemma 9.1. *Let $G \in \mathcal{G}_{xy}^\circ$ be a cascade in $\mathcal{S}_1$.*
(a) *If $H \in \mathcal{G}_{xy}^\circ$ is a proper minor of G and $\widehat{g}^+(H) = 2$, then H is a planar graph.*
(b) *If $H \in \mathcal{G}_{xy}^\circ$ is a minor of G such that $H \in \mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$, then H is planar.*

Proof. In case (b), H is a proper minor of G as wellby the properties (C1) and (C3) of cascades. Thus, in both cases, (a) and (b), there exists a minor operation $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G)$ such that H is a minor of μG. Since $\widehat{g}^+(H) = 2$ and $\widehat{g}^+$ is minor-monotone, $\widehat{g}^+(\mu G) \geq \widehat{g}^+(H) = 2$. By (C1), $\widehat{g}(H) < g(H) = 1$, which means that H is planar. □

Lemma 9.1 combined with (C2) implies that each graph $G \in \mathcal{S}_1$ contains a planar graph $H \in \mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$ as a minor. By Lemma 4.2, $\widehat{H}^+$ is either in $\mathcal{E}_1$ (an obstruction for the projective plane) or $\widehat{g}(H/xy) = \widehat{g}^+(H) = 2$. In the latter case, Lemma 4.3 shows that $\widehat{H}^+ \in \mathcal{E}_1^*$ and $\widehat{H/xy} \in \mathcal{E}_1$. The complete list of planar graphs in $\mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$ is depicted in Fig. 2. The list has been obtained as follows: We start with $\mathcal{E}_1$ which consists of 35 obstructions for the projective plane [1, 4]. Every planar graph obtained from one of these by removing an edge and using its ends as terminals x and y gives one of the graphs. Next, each of 68 ($= 103-35$) graphs $Q \in \mathcal{E}_1^* \setminus \mathcal{E}_1$ (cf. [4]) is tested to check if the removal of an edge xy yields a planar

graph $H \in \mathcal{G}^{\circ}_{xy}$ such that $H/xy = Q/xy \in \mathcal{E}_1$. A simple use of computer then reveals that the resulting planar cases are precisely those depicted in Fig. 2.

Theorem 9.2. *The class $\mathcal{C}^{\circ}_1(\widehat{g}^+)$ contains precisely 13 planar graphs that are depicted in Fig. 2. Every cascade in $\mathcal{S}_1$ contains one of these as a minor.*

Corollary 9.3. *Every planar graph in $\mathcal{C}^{\circ}_1(\widehat{g}^+)$ contains disjoint xy-K-graphs.*

The corollary can be proved by inspection of graphs in Fig. 2. However, it is not hard to see that Lemma 8.5 can be adapted to prove the corollary directly, without relying on the computer-assisted proof of Theorem 9.2.

A selection of nonplanar graphs in $\mathcal{C}^{\circ}_1(\widehat{g}^+)$ is depicted in Fig. 5. The consequence of Lemma 9.1(b) is that a graph $G \in \mathcal{S}_1$ cannot contain a graph in Fig. 5 as a minor. This will be used extensively in the proofs of Lemmas 9.10 and 9.11.

Next we prove, using minimality assumption on L_x, that in the case when $L_x \cong K_4$, B_y is attached to L_x only at the branch-vertices of L_x.

Lemma 9.4. *If $L_x \cong K_4$, then the attachments of B_y in L_x are branch-vertices of L_x.*

Proof. Let $w_0 = x, w_1, w_2$, and w_3 be the branch-vertices of L_x and let $P_{i,j}$ be the open branch of L_x connecting w_i and w_j. Assume for a contradiction that there is an attachment w of B_y on an open branch of L_x. Suppose first that w lies on $P_{1,2}$. Then there is an x-K-graph $L \cong K_{2,3}$ and disjoint from L_y: The subgraph L consists of the branch vertices w_1, w_2 and branches $P_{1,3} \cup P_{3,2}$, $P_{1,2}$, and $P_{1,0} \cup P_{0,2}$. Since B_y attaches to vertices x, w_3, and w, and L is a proper subgraph of L_x, L is indeed an x-K-graph disjoint from L_y, a contradiction to the minimality of L_x.

By symmetry, we may assume that w lies on $P_{1,0}$. Let e be the edge of L_x incident with x and $P_{1,0}$. Consider the graph $G' = G/e$. Since L_x/e is an x-K-graph of G disjoint from L_y, G'^+ contains two disjoint K-graphs and thus $\widehat{g}(G'^+) = 2$ by Lemma 7.5(i). If $e = wx$, then L_x/e is a K-graph in G' and $\widehat{g}(G') \geq 1$. Otherwise, L_x/e contains a K-graph $L \cong K_{2,3}$ as follows. The branch-vertices of L are w_1 and x. The branches of L are paths $P_{1,2} \cup P_{2,0}$, $P_{1,3} \cup P_{3,0}$, and $P_{1,0}$. Since B_y attaches on to vertices w_2, w_3, and w, the subgraph L is a K-graph in G' and $\widehat{g}(G') \geq 1$. We conclude that $\widehat{g}(G') = \widehat{g}(G)$ and $\widehat{g}(G'^+) = \widehat{g}(G^+)$ which violates (C1). □

Since $\widehat{g}(G) = 1$, at most one of L_x and L_y can be a K-graph in G (Lemma 7.4). Let us recall that the interior of L_x consists of x and all open branches of L_x that are incident with x.

Lemma 9.5. *If B_y is attached to the interior of L_x, then its only attachment in the interior of L_x is the vertex x. In such a case, B_x is not attached to the interior of L_y.*

Proof. If both B_y and B_x attach to the interior of L_x and L_y, respectively, then we obtain (using Lemma 9.4 if L_x or L_y is homeomorphic to K_4) that both L_x and L_y are K-graphs in G. By Lemma 7.5(i), $\widehat{g}(G) \geq 2$, a contradiction with $G \in \mathcal{S}_1$.



Figure 3: (a) A graph with L_x induced by x, v_0, v_1, v_2 and L_y induced by $y, v_3, v_4, v_5, v_6, v_9$. The set $U = \{v_1, v_2, v_9\}$ blocks L_y from L_x but not L_x from L_y. (b) A U-linkage with core L_y and feet $v_4v_{10}v_2$, v_9, $v_6v_8v_1$. Each of the feet $v_4v_{10}v_2$ and v_9 is removable but $v_6v_8v_1$ is not. This shows that L_y and U admit the linkage (4g) (shown in Fig. 4(g)) that is obtained by contracting the edges $v_3v_9, v_1v_8, v_2v_{10}$.

Suppose that B_y has an attachment in the interior of L_x that is different from x. Thus there exists an edge $e \in E(L_x)$ with both ends in the interior of L_x. Consider the graph G/e. Since L_x/e is a K-graph in G/e, $\widehat{g}(G/e) \geq 1$. Since L_x/e and L_y are xy-K-graphs in G/e, $\widehat{g}^+(G/e) \geq 2$. This contradicts (C1). □

When dealing with cascades in $\mathcal{S}_1$, we will consider a base H in G containing the xy-K-graphs L_x and L_y in G as introduced at the beginning of this section. We will explore how L_x and L_y are linked to each other by paths in H. To describe the linkages, we introduce some additional terminology that will be used to capture the situation inside the graph H.

Let H be a graph that contains a subgraph L, called *core*, homeomorphic to K_4 or $K_{2,3}$ with distinguished cycle C in L that contains two or three branch vertices of L. When $L = L_x$ or $L = L_y$, then we select C to be the cycle that does not contain the terminal x or y, respectively. We say that C is a *boundary cycle* of the core L. The edges and vertices of L that do not lie in C are said to be in the *interior* of L. For $U \subseteq V(H)$, we say that L is *U-linked* in H if there are $|U|$ disjoint paths in H connecting C and U that are internally disjoint from L. We say that H is a *U-linkage* of L if L is U-linked in H and the following holds. If $L \cong K_{2,3}$, then for every open branch t on the boundary of L there is a path in H from t to U that is internally disjoint from L; if $L \cong K_4$, then for every branch vertex t on the boundary of L there is a path in H from t to U that is internally disjoint from L. Existence of these paths will enable us to show that L is close to be a K-graph in H. Namely, if we add a new vertex adjacent to all vertices in U and to a vertex in the interior of L, then L contains a K-graph in the extended graph. If $u \in U$ has degree at least 2 in a U-linkage H, then u is called a *foot* of H. If $u \in U$ has degree 1, then the *foot* of H containing u is the path from u to a first vertex of degree at least 3. The foot containing u is also called the *u-foot* of H. A *u-foot* is *removable* if H is a $(U \setminus \{u\})$-linkage. The notion of a linkage will be used to describe a pre-K-graph in G together with essential paths that attach onto it.

A set $U \subseteq V(G)$ *separates* L_x and L_y in G if every (L_x, L_y)-path in G contains a vertex in U. We say that U *blocks* L_x *from* L_y in G if $U \cup \{x\}$ separates L_x and L_y and L_x is U-linked in G. The introduced terms are illustrated in Fig. 3.

Let k be the maximum number of pairwise disjoint paths in G connecting the boundaries

of L_x and L_y that are internally disjoint from L_x and L_y. Then we say that the xy-K-graphs L_x and L_y are *k-separated* in G.

Lemma 9.6. *If L_x and L_y are k-separated, then there exists a set $U \subseteq V(G)$ of cardinality k such that one of the following cases occurs:*

(i) *U blocks L_x from L_y and L_y from L_x.*

(ii) *U blocks L_x from L_y and $U \cup \{x\}$ blocks L_y from L_x.*

(iii) *$U \cup \{y\}$ blocks L_x from L_y and U blocks L_y from L_x.*

Proof. In the conclusions of the lemma, there is symmetry between x and y. Thus, we may assume by Lemma 9.5 that B_y is not attached to the interior of L_x. Let $P_1, \ldots, P_r$ be pairwise disjoint paths connecting L_x and L_y such that r is maximum and let U_0 be a minimum vertex-set that meets all paths connecting L_x and L_y. By Menger's Theorem, we have that $|U_0| = r$. Note that $r \geq k$. Assume first that $r = k$. In this case U_0 separates L_x and L_y. Since there are k pairwise disjoint paths connecting the boundaries of L_x and L_y and all of them meet U_0, both L_x and L_y are U_0-linked in G. We conclude that (i) holds.

Assume now that $r > k$. By Lemma 9.5, B_x has at most one attachment in the interior of L_y. Thus there is only one path, say P_r, that has an end in the interior of L_y. As noted at the beginning of the proof, none of the paths is attached to the interior of L_x. Since there are at most k disjoint paths joining the boundaries of L_x and L_y, we conclude that $r = k+1$. Let U_1 be a minimum vertex-cut (of size k) that meets all paths connecting the boundaries of L_x and L_y. Thus U_1 meets all the paths $P_1, \ldots, P_k$. We see that $U_1 \cup \{y\}$ separates L_x and L_y. Also, the paths $P_1, \ldots, P_r$ demonstrate that L_x is $(U_1 \cup \{y\})$-linked and that L_y is U_1-linked. We conclude that $U_1 \cup \{y\}$ blocks L_x from L_y and U_1 blocks L_y from L_x. Hence (iii) holds. The case (ii) occurs in the symmetric case when B_y attaches to the interior of L_x. □

In the next lemma we classify all possible types of U-linkages of small order. To do this, we need a way to say when an abstract U'-linkage H models a U-linkage in G. Consider the cascade G and let $z \in \{x, y\}$ and $U \subseteq V(G)$. We say that L_z and U *admit* a U'-linkage H if there exists a set $F \subseteq E(G)$ such that $L_z/(F \cap E(L_z))$ is a z-K-graph in G/F and H is isomorphic to a subgraph of G/F such that U' is mapped bijectively to U and the core of H is mapped to $L_z/(F \cap E(L_z))$.

Lemma 9.7. *Let H be a base of G and let $U \subseteq V(H)$. If U blocks L_x from L_y in H, then L_x and U admit a linkage. Furthermore, if $1 \leq |U| \leq 4$, then L_x and U admit a linkage from Fig. 4 (with some of the feet possibly of length zero).*

Proof. Since H is a base, it contains L_x and L_y, and these are K-graphs in H^+. Since U blocks L_x from L_y in H, there are three paths P_1, P_2, P_3 joining the branch vertices on the boundary of L_x with U (when $L_x \cong K_4$) or two paths P_1, P_2 from the interiors of both open branches on the boundary of L_x to U (when $L_x \cong K_{2,3}$). These paths are internally disjoint



Figure 4: Linkages to small sets. In each linkage, any subset of feet can be contracted.

from L_x by Lemma 9.5. Moreover, L_x is U-linked in H, so there are $|U|$ disjoint paths $Q_1, \ldots, Q_{|U|}$ joining the boundary of L_x with U. By definition, the union $R = L_x \cup_i P_i \cup_i Q_i$ form a U-linkage of L_x in H.

Let us now prove that L_x and U admit a linkage from Fig. 4 when $|U| \leq 4$. Assume first that $L_x \cong K_4$. By Lemma 9.4, $|U| \leq 3$ and there are three paths P_1, P_2, P_3 connecting the branch-vertices of L_x different from x to U. Choose the paths so that each pair is disjoint if possible. Assume that $U = \{u_1\}$. By contracting the edges of P_1, P_2, and P_3 that are not incident with L_x, we obtain that L_x admits the linkage (4a).

Assume now that $U = \{u_1, u_2\}$ is of size two. Since the paths Q_1, Q_2 also start at the branch vertices of L_x (by Lemma 9.4), we may assume that P_1 and P_2 are disjoint and connect L_x to u_1 and u_2, respectively. We may also assume that P_3 intersects only one of the other paths, say P_1. By contracting the edges of P_1, P_2, P_3 that are not incident with L_x, we obtain that L_x admits the linkage (4c).

Assume now that $U = \{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$ is of size three. Since there are three disjoint paths Q_1, Q_2, Q_3 connecting L_x and U, we may assume that P_1, P_2, and P_3 are pairwise disjoint. Thus L_x admits the linkage (4f).

Assume now that $L_x \cong K_{2,3}$. There are two paths P_1, P_2 connecting the open branches on the boundary of L_x to U. Choose the paths so that they are disjoint if possible. Assume that $U = \{u_1\}$. We see that L_x admits the linkage (4b). Assume now that $U = \{u_1, u_2\}$ is of size two. After possibly changing some of the paths, we may assume that $Q_1 = P_1$. If P_2 is disjoint from P_1, then L_x admits the linkage (4d). Otherwise we may assume that Q_2 is disjoint from P_2 and from the open branches of L_x. Hence L_x admits the linkage (4e).

Assume now that $U = \{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$ is of size three. We may assume that $Q_1 = P_1$. If P_2 is disjoint from P_1, then P_2 can be changed, if necessary, so that it intersects only one of Q_2, Q_3. Then it is easy to see that L_x admits the linkage (4g). Otherwise, we may assume

that P_2 intersects P_1 and that its segment from L_x to P_1 does not intersect Q_1, Q_2. Now it is easy to see that L_x admits the linkage (4h).

Assume now that $U = \{u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4\}$ is of size four. We may assume that $Q_1 = P_1$. If P_2 first intersects one of Q_2, Q_3, Q_4, then L_x admits the linkage (4i). If P_2 first intersects P_1, then one of Q_2, Q_3, Q_4 connects to an open branch of L_x which is a contradiction with the choice of P_1, P_2, since Q_2, Q_3, and Q_4 are disjoint from P_1. □

The following lemma will be used to reduce the number of cases when G admits linkages for L_x and L_y whose feet meet each other.

Lemma 9.8. *Suppose that H is a base of G such that L_x admits a U_1-linkage H_x and L_y admits a U_2-linkage H_y in H such that $U_1 \setminus U_2 \subseteq \{y\}$, $U_2 \setminus U_1 \subseteq \{x\}$, H_x and H_y are edge-disjoint, and there exists $u \in U_1 \cap U_2$ such that the u-feet of H_x and H_y are removable. Then there is a proper subbase of H. Moreover, neither L_x nor L_y is a K-graph in G.*

Proof. Since L_x is U_1-linked, there are pairwise-disjoint paths P_v, $v \in U_1$, connecting L_x and U_1. Similarly, there are pairwise-disjoint paths Q_v, $v \in U_2$ connecting L_y and U_2. We may assume by symmetry that $u \notin V(L_x)$. Thus P_u is a non-trivial path (but Q_u may possibly consist of a single vertex, u).

Let v_1v_2 be the edge in P_u such that $v_1 \in V(L_x)$ and $H' = H - v_1v_2$. We claim that H' is a base in G. Since u is a removable foot of H_x and H_y and $v_1v_2 \notin E(H_y)$, H_x is $(U_1 \setminus \{u\})$-linkage of L_x in H' and H_y is a $(U_2 \setminus \{u\})$-linkage of L_y in H'. Since, for each $v \in U_1 \setminus \{x, u\}$, it holds that $v \in U_2$, there is a path in H_y connecting v and y. Thus L_x is a pre-K-graph in H'. Similarly, L_y is also a pre-K-graph in H'. We conclude that H' is a base of G. This proves the first part of the lemma.

To prove the remaining claim, suppose for a contradiction that L_x is a K-graph in G. Let $G' = G - v_1v_2$. Since H' is a base of G', we have that $\widehat{g}^+(G') \geq 2$. Since $v_1 \in V(L_x)$, the L_x-bridge in G' containing y attaches to the same vertices of L_x as the L_x-bridge in G containing y, except possibly to v_1. Therefore, L_x is a K-graph in G' as u is a removable foot of H_x. Thus $\widehat{g}(G') \geq 1$ which contradicts (C1). The case when L_y is a K-graph in G is done similarly. □

Suppose that L_x and L_y are k-separated. By Lemma 9.6, there exists a set U of size k such that a statement (i), (ii), or (iii) of that lemma holds. If (i) holds, then L_x and L_y are blocked from each other by U. Otherwise, we may assume that (ii) holds and L_x is blocked from L_y by U and L_y is blocked from L_x by $U \cup \{x\}$. By Lemma 9.7, L_x admits a U-linkage H_x and L_y admits a U_y-linkage H_y. Assume that H_x and H_y are minimal (with respect to taking subgraphs).

If $|U| \leq 4$, then Lemma 9.7 asserts that H_x is one of the linkages in Fig. 4. In that case, let $u_1, \ldots, u_k$ be the vertices of U to which H_x is linked as depicted in Fig. 4. Similarly, when $|U_y| \leq 4$, H_y is one of the linkages in Fig. 4. Let $u'_1, \ldots, u'_r$ be the vertices of U_y in the order in which they are depicted in the picture of H_y in Fig. 4. In the following series of lemmas we shall describe all cascades that are at most 2-separated.

Lemma 9.9. *L_x and L_y are not 0-separated.*



Figure 5: Selected nonplanar graphs in $\mathcal{C}_1^\circ(\widehat{g^+})$.



Figure 6: Cascades in $\mathcal{S}_1$ whose xy-K-graphs are 1-separated.

Proof. Suppose that L_x and L_y are 0-separated. Since L_x is an x-K-graph in G, there is a path P connecting the boundary of L_x to L_y in G. Since P does not end on the boundary of L_y, P ends at a vertex in the interior of L_y. Thus B_x is attached to the interior of L_y. By symmetry, B_y is attached to the interior of L_x. This contradicts Lemma 9.5. □

Lemma 9.10. *If L_x and L_y are 1-separated, then G has one of the graphs in Fig. 6 as a minor.*

Proof. We adopt the notation and the assumptions made before Lemma 9.9. Then we have that H_x admits the linkage (4a) or (4b). Assume first that $U_y = U = \{u_1\}$. Then H_y also admits one of (4a) or (4b). Let G_z be the U-bridge in G containing L_z, $z \in \{x, y\}$. Since U separates L_x and L_y in G, the U-bridges G_x and G_y are distinct. Since G is nonplanar, one of G_x or G_y, say G_y by symmetry, is nonplanar by Theorem 2.2. Suppose that G_y is not isomorphic to a Kuratowski graph. Then there exists a minor-operation $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G_y)$ such that μG_y is nonplanar. The graph μG^+ contains a K-graph and a Kuratowski subgraph whose intersection is either empty or equal to u_1. Thus, $\widehat{g}^+(\mu G) \geq 2$ by Lemma 7.5(ii), a contradiction with (C1). Thus G_y is isomorphic to either K_5 or $K_{3,3}$. It is not hard to see that $yu_1 \in E(G)$ in both cases. We conclude that G has one of the graphs in Fig. 6 as a minor.

Assume now that $U_y = U \cup \{x\}$. In this case H_y is one of (4c), (4d), or (4e). Since L_y is linked to $\{u_1, x\}$, there are two choices for the vertices u'_1 and u'_2. In each case, we will be able to find a minor in G isomorphic to one of nonplanar graphs in $\mathcal{C}_2^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$ depicted in Figure 5. As noted earlier, this contradicts Lemma 9.1. We treat different cases and note that the worst case is always when every foot of the corresponding linkage in Figure 4 is trivial (i.e. a single vertex), except when this is excluded because that would make L_x and L_y intersect.

Case 1: H_y is (4c).

If $u'_1 = u_1$ and $u'_2 = x$, then H_y contains (4d) as a sublinkage (with u'_1 being a trivial foot), which is treated in Case 2 below. Suppose then that $u'_1 = x$ and $u'_2 = u_1$. If H_x is (4a), then G has (5a) as a minor. If H_x is (4b), then G has (5b) as a minor.

Case 2: H_y is (4d).

Since (4d) has a symmetry exchanging its feet, we may assume that $u'_1 = u_1$ and $u'_2 = x$. If H_x is (4a), then G has (5c) as a minor. If H_x is (4b), then G has (5d) as a minor.

Case 3: H_y is (4e).

If $u'_1 = u_1$ and $u'_2 = x$, then H_y contains (4d) as a sublinkage (having u'_1 as a trivial foot), where we contract an edge incident with y and remove the other one. Suppose thus that $u'_1 = x$ and $u'_2 = u_1$. If H_x is (4a), then G has (5e) as a minor. If H_x is (4b), then G has (5f) as a minor. □

We deal with 2-separated K-graphs similarly.

Lemma 9.11. *If L_x and L_y are 2-separated, then G has one of the graphs in Fig. 7 as a minor.*

Proof. We have that H_x is one of (4c), (4d), or (4e). Assume first that $U_y = U = \{u_1, u_2\}$. Let G_z be the U-bridge containing L_z, $z \in \{x, y\}$. Since U separates L_x and L_y in G, the U-bridges G_x and G_y are distinct. We will consider G_x and G_y as graphs in $\mathcal{G}_{u_1u_2}$, with terminals u_1 and u_2. Since G is nonplanar, Lemma 7.1 gives that either G_x^+ or G_y^+ is nonplanar. We may assume by symmetry that G_y^+ is nonplanar. Thus G_y contains a graph in $\mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$ as a minor. Suppose that there exists a minor-operation $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G_y)$ such that μG_y^+ is nonplanar. Then μG^+ contains a K-graph in G_x and a Kuratowski graph that satisfy the conditions of Lemma 7.5(ii) or (iii). (To see this, note that a Kuratowski graph in μG_y^+ gives rise to a Kuratowski graph in G^+ by replacing the edge u_1u_2 with a path in G_x. The path can be chosen in such a way that it intersects with L_y in a subpath. If this one would not satisfy (ii), then the linkage in G_x is (4d) with both feet trivial, and hence we get that (iii) is satisfied.) By Lemma 7.5, $\widehat{g}^+(\mu G) \geq 2$, a contradiction. We conclude that G_y is isomorphic to one of the three graphs in $\mathcal{C}_0^\circ(\widehat{g}^+)$ (with terminals u_1 and u_2). Since L_y is 2-linked to u_1, u_2, we have that $y \notin \{u_1, u_2\}$. If H_x is (4c) or (4e), then H_x contains (4d) as a sublinkage. Suppose now that H_x is (4d). If G_y is isomorphic to (1a), then G has (5n) as a minor. If G_y is isomorphic to (1b), then G has (5u) as a minor. If G_y is isomorphic to (1c), then G has (5k) or (5l) as a minor. In each case, we obtain a contradiction by Lemma 9.1.

Assume now that $U_y = U \cup \{x\}$. Hence H_y is one of (4f), (4g), or (4h).

Case 1: H_y is (4f).

This case is symmetric. If H_x is (4c), then G has (5i) as a minor. If H_x is (4d), then G has (5m) as a minor. If H_x is (4e), then G has (5v) as a minor (hint: delete two edges in H_y).

Case 2: H_y is (4g).

Suppose that H_x is (4c). If $u'_2 = u_1$, then G has (5p) as a minor (hint: contract an edge joining H_x and H_y). If $u'_2 = u_2$, then G has (5t) as a minor (hint: delete two edges in H_x). If $u'_2 = x$, then G has (7a) as a minor.

Suppose now that H_x is (4d). If $u'_2 = u_1$, then G has (5t) as a minor. If $u'_2 = x$, then G has (7b) as a minor.

Suppose now that H_x is (4e). Since u_2-foot is removable in H_x and u'_2-foot is removable in H_y, Lemma 9.8 asserts that $u_2 \neq u'_2$ (as L_x is a K-graph in G). If $u'_2 = u_1$, then G has (5v) as a minor (hint: contract one and delete another edge in H_y, both incident with the vertex



Figure 7: Cascades in $\mathcal{S}_1$ whose xy-K-graphs are 2-separated.

linked to u_2). If $u'_2 = x$, then again, G has (5v) as a minor (hint: delete one and contract the other edge incident with y in H_y).

Case 3: H_y is (4h).

Suppose that H_x is (4d). If $u'_1 = u_1$, then G has (5w) as a minor (hint: delete one and contract the other edge incident with y). If $u'_1 = x$, then G has (5r) as a minor.

Suppose that H_x is (4c). If $u'_1 = u_1$, then H_x has (4d) as a sublinkage. So this is covered above. If $u'_1 = u_2$, then G has (5o) as a minor. If $u'_1 = x$, then G has (5r) as a minor.

Suppose that H_x is (4e). Since u_2-foot is removable in H_x and u'_2-foot and u'_3-foot are removable in H_y, Lemma 9.8 asserts that $u'_1 = u_2$. Then G has (5j) as a minor. □

For xy-K-graphs that are k-separated for $k \geq 4$, we shall use the fact that they admit linkages that have many removable feet.

Lemma 9.12. *Suppose that H is a U-linkage, where $|U| \geq 4$. Then H has at least $|U| - 2$ removable feet.*

Proof. Let H be a U-linkage with core L, $|U| = k \geq 4$. By Lemma 9.4, $L \cong K_{2,3}$. Let $P_1, \ldots, P_k$ be pairwise disjoint paths connecting L and $U = \{u_1, \ldots, u_k\}$ and suppose that P_i ends at u_i, $i = 1, \ldots, k$. Since H is a U-linkage, there are paths Q_1 and Q_2 connecting the open branches on the boundary of L to U. For $j = 1, 2$, let v_j be the first vertex on Q_j that belongs to $P_1 \cup P_2 \cup \cdots \cup P_k$ when traversing Q_j from L towards U. Let i_j be the index such that $v_j \in V(P_{i_j})$. It is easy to see that, for $i \neq i_1, i_2$, the u_i-foot of H is removable. Thus H has at least $k - 2$ removable feet. □

Let $\mathcal{B}$ be the set of the five xy-labeled graphs depicted in Fig. 8. A graph H is a *planar minor* of G if H is a minor of a planar subgraph of G.

Lemma 9.13. *If H is a base in G such that the xy-K-graphs in H are k-separated for $k \geq 3$, then G contains one of the graphs in $\mathcal{B}$ as a planar minor.*

Proof. We may assume that H does not contain a proper subbase that is l-separated for some $l \geq 3$.

Suppose first that $k = 3$. We have that H_x is one of (4f), (4g), or (4h). Assume first that $U_y = U$. In this case, H_y is also one of (4f), (4g), or (4h).

Case 1: H_y is (4h).



(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

Figure 8: Set $\mathcal{B}$ of bases of cascades in $\mathcal{S}_1$ whose xy-K-graphs are k-separated for $k \geq 3$.

If H_x is (4f), then G has (5h) as a minor. Suppose that H_x is (4g). There are two cases by symmetry: If $u'_1 = u_1$, then G has (5t) as a minor. (Hint: contract one and delete the other edge incident with y in H_y.) If $u'_1 = u_2$, then G has (5q) as a minor.

Suppose now that H_x is (4h). There are two cases by symmetry: If $u'_1 = u_1$, then G has (5w) as a minor. (Hint: Let the two neighbors of x and y be a, b and c, d, respectively, where ac and bd is part of the linkage. Then we contract the edges xb and yc and delete the edges xa and yd. The vertex $u'_1 = u_1$ corresponds to the vertex of degree 4 in (5w).) If $u'_1 = u_2$, then G has (5r) as a minor. By symmetry, we may assume now that neither H_x nor H_y is (4h).

Case 2: H_y is (4f).

If H_x is (4f), then G has (8a) as a planar minor. If H_x is (4g), then G has (8b) as a planar minor. By symmetry, we may assume now that neither H_x nor H_y is (4f).

Case 3: H_y is (4g).

The only remaining case is when H_x is (4g). If $u'_2 = u_2$, then G has (8c) as a planar minor. If $u'_2 = u_1$, then G has (8d) as a planar minor.

Assume now that $U_y = U \cup \{x\}$. Hence H_y is (4i). If $u'_2 = x$ or $u'_4 = x$, then H_y contains linkage (4g) and this case was dealt with above. We may thus assume that $u'_1 = x$. If H_x is (4f), then G has (5g) as a minor.

Suppose now that H_x is (4g). By Lemma 9.8, $u'_2 \neq u_2$ and $u'_4 \neq u_2$. Thus $u'_3 = u_2$ and G has (5s) as a minor. On the other hand, if H_x is (4h), then Lemma 9.8 gives that $u'_2, u'_4 \notin \{u_2, u_3, x\}$ which is impossible.

Suppose now that $k = 4$. Assume first that L_x and L_y are 4-separated and suppose that $U_y = U$. Thus both H_x and H_y are (4i). By Lemma 9.8, $\{u'_2, u'_4\} \cap \{u_2, u_4\} = \emptyset$. Thus we may assume by symmetry that $u'_1 = u_2$, $u'_2 = u_3$, $u'_3 = u_4$, and $u'_4 = u_1$. We conclude that G has (8e) as a planar minor.

We may assume now that $U_y = U \cup \{x\}$. By Lemma 9.12, H_y has three removable feet. Since H_x has two removable feet, there exists $u \in U$ such that the u-feet of H_x and H_y are removable. By Lemma 9.8, this contradicts our initial assumption that H does not contain a proper subbase that is 3-separated.



(a) (b) (c) (d) (e)

Figure 9: The class $\mathcal{B}^* \setminus \mathcal{B}$.

Assume now that $k > 4$. By Lemma 9.12, there are at most two elements u in U such that either the u-foot of H_x or the u-foot of H_y is not removable. Since $|U| > 4$, there exists $u' \in U$ such that the u'-feet of H_x and H_y are removable. By Lemma 9.8, there is a proper subbase of H that is $(k-1)$-separated, a contradiction with our initial assumption about H. □

10 Nonplanar extensions of planar bases

Let $\mathcal{B}^*$ be the class of planar graphs that contain a graph in $\mathcal{B}$ as a minor and that are deletion-minimal. These graphs are obtained from $\mathcal{B}$ by splitting vertices of degree 4 in all possible ways such that planarity and minimality are preserved. It is not hard to check that $\mathcal{B}^*$ contains only five graphs that are not contained in $\mathcal{B}$ (see Fig. 9). In this section, we describe the minimal nonplanar graphs that contain a subgraph homeomorphic to a graph in $\mathcal{B}^*$. Having this description, we use computer to determine the class $\mathcal{S}_1$. The graphs in $\mathcal{S}_1$ that have a subgraph homeomorphic to a graph in $\mathcal{B}^*$ are depicted in Fig. 11.

Let H_0 be a subdivision of $K_{3,3}$, let v be a branch vertex of H_0, and let u_1, u_2, u_3 be the neighbors of v. The graph $H = H_0 - v$ is called a *tripod*. The three (possibly trivial) paths in H with ends u_1, u_2, u_3, respectively, are the *feet* of H. We say that H is *attached* to a subgraph K of G if H is contained in a K-bridge B, u_1, u_2, u_3 are attachments of B, and B has no other attachments. We use the following classical theorem (see [6, Theorem 6.3.1]).

Theorem 10.1. *Let G be a connected graph and C a cycle in G. Let G' be a graph obtained from G by adding a new vertex joined to all vertices of C. Then G can be embedded in the plane with C as an outer cycle unless G contains an obstruction of the following type:*

(a) *disjoint paths whose ends are on C and their order on C is interlaced (disjoint crossing paths),*

(b) *a tripod attached to C, or*

(c) *a Kuratowski subgraph contained in a 3-connected block of G' distinct from the 3-connected block of G' containing C.*

We formalize homeomorphisms of graphs as follows. Let G, H be graphs. A mapping η with domain $V(H) \cup E(H)$ is called a *homeomorphic embedding* of H into G if for every two vertices v, v' and every two edges e, e' of H

(i) $\eta(v)$ is a vertex of G, and if v, v' are distinct then $\eta(v), \eta(v')$ are distinct,

(ii) if e has ends v, v', then $\eta(e)$ is a path in G with ends $\eta(v), \eta(v')$, and otherwise disjoint from $\eta(V(H))$, and

(iii) if e, e' are distinct, then $\eta(e)$ and $\eta(e')$ are edge-disjoint, and if they have a vertex in common, then this vertex is an end of both.

We shall denote the fact that η is a homeomorphic embedding of H into G by writing $\eta : H \hookrightarrow G$. If K is a subgraph of H, then we denote by $\eta(K)$ the subgraph of G consisting of all vertices $\eta(v)$, where $v \in V(H)$, and all vertices and edges that belong to $\eta(e)$ for some $e \in E(K)$. Note that $\eta(V(K)) \subseteq V(\eta(K))$ mean different sets. It is easy to see that G has a subgraph homeomorphic to H if and only if there is a homeomorphic embedding $H \hookrightarrow G$. An *η-bridge* is an $\eta(H)$-bridge in G; an *η-branch* is an image of an edge of H. A bridge is *local* if all its vertices of attachment are on a single branch $\eta(e)$, $e \in E(H)$.

The following result is well-known (see [6], Lemma 6.2.1).

Lemma 10.2. *Let H be a graph with at least three vertices and η a homeomorphic embedding of H into a 3-connected graph G. Then there exists a homeomorphic embedding η' such that:*

(i) *$\eta(v) = \eta'(v)$ for each $v \in V(H)$.*

(ii) *$\eta'(e)$ is a path that is contained in the union of $\eta(e)$ and all local $\eta(e)$-bridges.*

(iii) *There are no local η'-bridges.*

In order to apply Lemma 10.2 to a base in $\mathcal{B}^*$, we need to assure that new homeomorphic embedding still maps terminals to terminals. We will need the following lemmas.

Lemma 10.3. *Suppose that $G \in \mathcal{S}_1$ has a base homeomorphic to a graph in $\mathcal{B}^*$ and that K is a Kuratowski subgraph of G. If none of the branch vertices of K lie in L_x, then two of its open branches intersect L_x. The same holds for the intersection of K with L_y.*

Proof. Assume for a contradiction that K is disjoint from L_x except possibly for an open branch P of K. By inspection of graphs in $\mathcal{B}^*$, we see that there is an edge e incident with L_x such that L_x is an x-K-graph in G/e and there is a Kuratowski subgraph K' in G/e that shares at most one half-open branch with L_x. By Lemma 7.5, $\widehat{g}^+(G/e) \geq 2$. Since G/e is nonplanar, this contradicts the condition (C1) from the definition of cascades. □

Lemma 10.4. *Let U be a vertex-cut in $G \in \mathcal{S}_1$. If $|U| \leq 2$, then each nontrivial U-bridge in G contains either x or y.*

Proof. Let B be a nontrivial U-bridge that contains neither x nor y. If $|U| = 1$, let $G_1 = G - B^\circ$. If $U = \{u, v\}$ has size 2, let $G_1 = G - B^\circ + uv$. Since Kuratowski graphs are 3-connected, G_1 contains the same disjoint xy-K-graphs as G. Thus $\widehat{g}^+(G_1) = 2$ by Lemma 7.5(i). Since G_1 is a proper minor of G, $\widehat{g}(G_1) = 0$ by (C1). If $|U| = 1$, Theorem 2.2 implies that B is nonplanar since G is nonplanar. If $|U| = 2$, then Lemma 7.1 implies that $B+uv$ is nonplanar since G is nonplanar. We may assume by symmetry that $|V(L_y) \cap U| \leq 1$. Let us now consider an edge $e \in E(L_x)$ (with $e \neq uv$ if $|U| = 2$) and the graph $G_0 = G/e$. The graph G_0 is nonplanar since it contains B or $B + uv$ as a minor. Also G_0^+ contains a Kuratowski subgraph in B and a K-graph L_y that intersect in at most one vertex or in at most one half-open branch. Lemma 7.5(ii) gives that $\widehat{g}^+(G_0) = 2$. This is a contradiction with (C1). □

Lemma 10.5. *Let H be a base of a graph $G \in \mathcal{S}_1$, and $\eta : H \hookrightarrow G$ a homeomorphic embedding of H in G. If $L_x \cong K_{2,3}$ and P is the branch of L_x that contains the interior of L_x, then there are no local η-bridges with attachments only on P.*

Proof. Let C be the boundary of L_x which consists of the η-branches P_1, P_2. Assume first that there is an η-bridge B_0 that attaches only at the ends w_1, w_2 of P. By Lemma 10.4, B_0 is trivial and consists of the edge w_1w_2. Let $G' = G - w_1w_2$. Since $\widehat{g}^+(G') \geq 2$, we have that G' is planar by (C1). Since G is nonplanar, there are paths P_3 and P_4 connecting $P - w_1 - w_2$ to $P_1 - w_1 - w_2$ and $P_2 - w_1 - w_2$, respectively. Let P_5 be a path in B_y connecting $P_1 - w_1 - w_2$ and $P_2 - w_1 - w_2$. The planarity of G' implies that P_3 and P_4 are internally disjoint from L_y, and therefore $L_x \cup P_3 \cup P_4 \cup P_5 \cup w_1w_2$ contains a Kuratowski subgraph K. The intersection of K with L_y is contained in P_5. This contradicts Lemma 10.3.

We may assume now that all η-bridges that are attach to P, have a vertex of attachment in the interior of P. Let B' be a local η-bridge with an attachment $t \in V(P) \setminus \{w_1, w_2\}$. Let G' be the graph obtained from G by deleting an edge e of B' incident with t. Since $\widehat{g}^+(G') \geq 2$, we have that G' is planar by (C1). Let B be the C-bridge containing $\cup B'$. Since G is nonplanar, B cannot be drawn inside a disk with C on the boundary. By Theorem 10.1, there are three possibilities. The option (iii) contradicts Lemma 10.3. Suppose that (i) holds and let P_3, P_4 be a pair of crossing paths. Since B is connected, there is a path P_5 connecting interiors of P_3 and P_4. Thus $C \cup P_3 \cup P_4 \cup P_5$ is a $K_{3,3}$-minor which contradicts Lemma 10.3. Suppose now that (ii) holds and there is a tripod T in $C \cup B$. If T has a foot of nonzero length, then $C \cup T$ contains a $K_{3,3}$-minor. Otherwise, there is a path P_5 connecting the two triads that T consists of. Hence $C \cup T \cup P_5$ contains a K_5-minor. In both cases, Lemma 10.3 yields a contradiction. □

Let H be a planar 3-connected graph and η a homeomorphic embedding of H into G. A well-known result of Tutte [14] says that $\eta(H)$ has a unique embedding in the plane where each face is a cycle. Let us call each such a cycle an *η-face*. An *η-path* is a path in G with ends in $\eta(H)$ but otherwise disjoint from $\eta(H)$. An *η-jump* is an η-path such that no η-face includes both of its ends.

An *η-cross* consists of two disjoint η-paths P_1, P_2 with ends u_1, v_1 and u_2, v_2 (respectively) on a common η-face such that the ends appear in the interlaced order u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2 on the

boundary of the face. An η-cross P_1, P_2 is *free* if neither P_1 nor P_2 has its ends on $\eta(e)$ for a single $e \in E(H)$ and, whenever the ends of P_1 and P_2 are in $V(\eta(e_1)) \cup V(\eta(e_2))$ for $e_1, e_2 \in E(H)$, then e_1 and e_2 have no end in common.

An *η-triad* is an $\eta(H)$-bridge B with three attachments that consists of three internally disjoint paths P_1, P_2, P_3 connecting the attachments to a vertex $v \in V(G) \setminus V(\eta(H))$. Furthermore, every pair of attachments of B lie on a common η-face but no η-face contains all the attachments.

An *η-tripod* in G is a tripod whose feet are in $\eta(H)$, but none of its other vertices or edges is in $\eta(H)$. Let C be an η-face and $v_1, v_2, v_3 \in V(C)$ branch-vertices of $\eta(H)$. Let Q be the union of one or two η-branches, each with both ends in $\{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$. A *weak η-tripod* is a tripod B in G with attachments v_1, v_2, v_3 such that $B \cap \eta(H) = Q \cup \{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$ (see Figure 10, where v_1, v_2, v_3 correspond to the square vertices).

We will use the following well-known result.

Lemma 10.6. *Let G be a subdivision of a 3-connected plane graph. Then each pair of intersecting faces of G share either a single branch-vertex or a single branch.*

We say that a graph $G \in \mathcal{G}^{\circ}_{xy}$ is *essentially 3-connected* if G^+ is 3-connected. The following lemma and its proof are adapted from [12].

Lemma 10.7. *Suppose that $G \in \mathcal{S}_1$ has a base homeomorphic to a graph $H \in \mathcal{B}^*$. Then there exists a homeomorphic embedding $\eta : H \hookrightarrow G$, mapping the terminals of H to the terminals of G, such that one of the following holds:*

(W1) *There exists an η-jump.*

(W2) *There exists a free η-cross.*

(W3) *There exists an η-tripod or a weak η-tripod.*

(W4) *There exists an η-triad.*

Proof. Since H has three internally disjoint paths joining the two terminals and η maps the terminals of H to x and y, Lemma 10.4 gives that G is essentially 3-connected. By Lemmas 10.2 and 10.5, there exists a homeomorphic embedding η from H into G such that there are no local η-bridges and terminals are mapped onto terminals by η. Suppose that none of (W1)–(W4) holds for η. Let B be an η-bridge and S the set of attachments of B. By excluding (W1), any two elements of S lie on the same η-face. Not having (W4), each triple in S must lie on the same η-face. We claim that all vertices in S are contained in one of the faces. To see this, we will use induction. Let $k \geq 3$ and let us assume that for each subset S' of S of size k, there exists an η-face F such that S' lie on F. We shall prove that the same holds for each subset of S of size $k+1$. Suppose for a contradiction that $S_0 = \{v_1, \ldots, v_{k+1}\}$ is a subset of S of size $k+1$ such that there is no η-face that contains S_0. For $i = 1, \ldots, k+1$, let F_i be the η-face that contains $S_0 \setminus \{v_i\}$. Thus F_i are pairwise distinct. In particular, each vertex v_i belongs to $k \geq 3$ distinct faces in $\{F_1, \ldots, F_{k+1}\} \setminus \{F_i\}$ and thus v_i is a branch



Figure 10: Weak tripods from the proof of Lemma 10.7.

vertex of $\eta(H)$. Since v_1 and v_2 belong to both F_3 and F_4, Lemma 10.6 gives that there is an η-branch P_{12} that contains v_1 and v_2. Similarly, there is an η-branch P_{ij} for each pair $i, j = 1, \ldots, k+1$. The branch vertices v_i and the paths P_{ij} form a subdivision of K_{k+1}. This implies that $k = 3$. However, for graphs in $\mathcal{B}^*$, no subgraph isomorphic to K_4 has each triple of its vertices on the same face. With this contradiction we conclude that there exists an η-face that contains S.

Since there are no local η-bridges, for each η-bridge B, there exists a unique η-face F_B such that F_B contains all attachments of B. For an η-face F, let G_F be the union of all η-bridges whose attachments are contained in F. Since G is nonplanar, there exists an η-face F such that G_F does not embed inside F. By excluding (W3) and by Theorem 10.1, there is an η-cross P_1, P_2 in F. Let u_i, v_i be the ends of P_i, $i = 1, 2$. Pick P_1 and P_2 so that number of pairs in $\{u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2\}$ that lie on a single η-branch is minimized. Assume first that u_1 and v_1 lie on a single η-branch Q_1. Since the bridge containing P_1 is not local, there is a path P_3 connecting P_1 and an η-branch Q_2 distinct from Q_1. If also u_2 and v_2 lie on Q_1, then this yields a contradiction as $P_1 \cup P_2 \cup P_3$ contains an η-cross where the ends do not lie on a single η-branch. Thus we may assume that the pair u_2, v_2 does not share a common η-branch. If P_3 is disjoint from P_2, then $P_1 \cup P_2 \cup P_3$ contains an η-cross where the pairs u_1, v_1 and u_2, v_2 do not share a common η-branch. This again contradicts the choice of P_1 and P_2. If P_3 intersects P_2 (even if only at its endpoint), let P_3' be the subpath of P_3 from P_1 to the first vertex on P_2, and let P be the path in Q_1 from u_1 to v_1. Then $P \cup P_1 \cup P_2 \cup P_3$ forms a weak η-tripod (see Figure 10(a)). This gives (W3). Finally, we may assume by symmetry that none of the pairs u_1, v_1 and u_2, v_2 share a common η-branch. Then we have (W2), unless there are two η-branches Q_1, Q_2 that share a branch vertex and so that u_1, u_2 lie on Q_1 and v_1, v_2 lie on Q_2. This gives (W3) as $P_1 \cup P_2 \cup Q_1 \cup Q_2$ contains a weak η-tripod (see Figure 10(b)). We conclude that η satisfies one of (W1)–(W4). □

Even a stronger version of Lemma 10.7 can be proved.

Lemma 10.8. *Let $G \in \mathcal{S}_1$ that has a base homeomorphic to a graph $H \in \mathcal{B}^*$. Then there exists a homeomorphic embedding $\eta : H \hookrightarrow G$ such that one of the following holds:*

(T1) *There exists an η-jump.*

(T2) *There exists an η-cross that attaches onto branch-vertices of $\eta(H)$.*

(T3) *There exists a (weak) η-tripod with trivial feet that attaches onto branch-vertices of $\eta(H)$.*

(T4) *There exist branch-vertices u_1, u_2, u_3 of $\eta(H)$ such that no two of them lie on a common η-branch and there exists an η-triad that attaches onto u_1, u_2, and u_3.*

Moreover, G is the union of $\eta(H)$ and the corresponding obstruction in (T1)–(T4).

Proof. Lemma 10.7 yields a homeomorphic embedding $\eta : H \hookrightarrow G$ such that one of (W1)–(W4) holds. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(G)$. If μG admits a homeomorphic embedding $\eta' : H \hookrightarrow \mu G$ that satisfies one of (W1)–(W4), then $\widehat{g}^+(\mu G) \geq \widehat{g}^+(H) = 2$ and μG is nonplanar. This contradicts the property (C1) of cascades. Let us describe sufficient conditions that yield this contradiction. Clearly, if μ is deletion of an edge $e \notin \eta(H)$ that also does not appear in the obstruction given by (W1)–(W4), then $\eta, G - e$ contradicts (C1). This yields the last statement in the lemma. If μ is a contraction of an edge $e \in \eta(H)$ and one of its ends is not a terminal or a branch-vertex of $\eta(H)$ and, furthermore, the ends of e are not attachments of the obstruction given by (W1)–(W4), then there is a homeomorphic embedding $\eta' : H \hookrightarrow \mu G$ that satisfies one of (W1)–(W4), a contradiction.

Suppose that none of (T1)–(T4) holds. Thus one of (W2)–(W4) holds. Assume first that (W2) or (W3) holds and let B be the union of η-bridges as given by (W2) or (W3). Let C be an η-face of $\eta(H)$ that contains all attachments of B. Let us prove that C contains no terminals. Suppose to the contrary that C contains x. Thus $C \cup B$ contains a K-graph of G. Let $e \in E(\eta(H)) \setminus E(L_x)$ be an edge that is incident with L_x and not incident with C. By inspection of $\mathcal{B}^*$, the graph G/e contains two disjoint K-graphs and $C \cup B$ contains a K-graph of G/e. This contradicts (C1) by Lemma 7.5(i). Hence we may assume that C contains no terminals.

Assume that (W2) holds. Since (T2) does not hold, there is a free η-cross P_1, P_2 such that P_1 has attachment u_1 on an open branch Q of $\eta(H)$. Let u_1, v_1 and u_2, v_2 be the attachments of P_1 and P_2, respectively. Let e_1 and e_2 be the edges of Q incident with u_1. Consider the graphs $G_1 = G/e_1$ and $G_2 = G/e_2$. Since Q is an η-branch of length at least 2, η induces homeomorphic embeddings $\eta_1 : H \hookrightarrow G_1$ and $\eta_2 : H \hookrightarrow G_2$. Suppose P_1, P_2 is a free η_1-cross. Then G_1 is nonplanar and, since G_1 has a base $\eta_1(H)$, we have that $\widehat{g}^+(G_1) \geq 2$. This contradicts (C1). Thus P_1, P_2 is not a free η_1-cross. Similarly P_1, P_2 is not a free η_2-cross. Let $e_1 = u_1w_1$ and $e_2 = u_1w_2$. Since P_1, P_2 is a free η-cross, we may assume that $w_1 \notin \{u_2, v_2\}$. Since P_1, P_2 is not a free η_1-cross, P_1 has both ends on a single η_1-branch Q_1. If $w_2 \in \{u_2, v_2\}$, then the ends of P_1, P_2 lie on $Q \cup Q_1$ in G, a contradiction. Thus we may assume that $w_2 \notin \{u_2, v_2\}$ and we obtain by symmetry that P_1 has both ends on a single η_2-branch Q_2. We conclude that Q, Q_1, Q_2 is a subdivision of a triangle, v_1 is the common vertex of Q_1 and Q_2, w_1 is the common vertex of Q and Q_1, w_2 is the common vertex of Q and Q_2, and u_2, v_2 lie on Q_1, Q_2, respectively. Let e_3 be the edge of Q_1 that is incident with u_2 and lies between w_1 and u_2. Consider the graph $G_3 = G/e_3$. Clearly, G_3 satisfies either (W2) or (W3) and thus contradicts (C1).

Assume that (W3) holds. Since (T3) does not hold, either B has a nontrivial foot or B has an attachment on an open η-branch. Suppose first that B has a nontrivial foot P. Since



Figure 11: Cascades in $\mathcal{S}_1$ whose xy-K-graphs are k-separated for $k \geq 3$.

P contains no terminals, contracting P preserves (W3). This is a contradiction with the observation made above. Suppose now that u is an attachment of B on an open η-branch Q_1. Let $uv \in E(Q_1)$ be an edge incident with u. Since u is not a terminal and v is not an attachment of B by Observation 2.3, G/uv contradicts (C1).

Assume that (W4) holds. By Observation 2.3, the attachments u_1, u_2, u_3 of B are independent. Since (T4) does not hold, we may assume that u_1 lies on an open η-branch Q. If $u_1 = x$ and L is the x-K-graph in $\eta(H)$, then $L \cup B$ contains a Kuratowski subgraph that is disjoint from the y-K-graph, a contradiction with Lemma 10.3. Thus we may assume that u_1 is not a terminal. Let u_1w_1, u_1w_2 be the edges of Q incident with u_1 and let $G_1 = G/u_1w_1$ and G_2/u_1w_2. Since both G_1 and G_2 admit a homeomorphic embedding of H, they are both planar. Thus there is an η-face that contains the vertices w_1, u_2, u_3 and an η-face that contains the vertices w_2, u_2, u_3. It is not hard to see that u_2, u_3 is a 2-vertex-cut in G that blocks L_x and L_y, a contradiction. □

The list of minimal graphs satisfying the conditions of Lemma 10.8 was generated by computer[4] and checked for which of them are in $\mathcal{S}_1$. The outcome of this computation is the following theorem. A proof by hand would be possible but would involve detailed case analysis that can be as error-prone as a computer program.

Theorem 10.9. *The class $\mathcal{S}_1$ consists of* 21 *graphs which are depicted in Figs. 6, 7, and 11.*

[4]The programs used and the graphs generated are archived at `arXiv.org` along with the original manuscript of this paper.

Proof. Let us give detailed overview of the proof and indicate which parts of the proof rely on computer verification. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the set of 21 graphs depicted in Figures 6, 7, and 11. To show that $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_1$, we have to prove that each graph $G \in \mathcal{C}$ satisfies (C1)–(C3) and $\widehat{g}^+(G) = 2$. We are not aware of a faster method than computing $\widehat{g}(\mu G)$ and $\widehat{g}^+(\mu G)$ for all minor-operations $\mu \in M(G)$ and then checking that (C1)–(C3) were satisfied. This was verified by computer for every graph in $\mathcal{C}$.

In order to show that $\mathcal{S}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, let us consider a graph $G \in \mathcal{S}_1$. By Lemma 8.5, G contains disjoint xy-K-graphs that are k-separated for some $k \geq 0$. If $k \leq 2$, then Lemmas 9.9, 9.10, and 9.11 give that $G \in \mathcal{C}$. If $k \geq 3$, then Lemma 9.13 asserts that G has a base that is homeomorphic to a graph $H \in \mathcal{B}^*$. By Lemma 10.8, there is a homeomorphic embedding of H into G such that one of (T1)–(T4) holds. By computer, we have constructed all those graphs (which yields several hundred) and verified that all of these graphs that satisfy (C1)–(C3) belong to $\mathcal{C}$. □

References

[1] D. Archdeacon. A Kuratowski theorem for the projective plane. *J. Graph Theory*, 5(3):243–246, 1981.

[2] S. Cabello and B. Mohar. Crossing number and weighted crossing number of near-planar graphs. *Algorithmica*, 60:484–504, 2011.

[3] J. Chambers. Hunting for torus obstructions. Master's thesis, Dept. of Computer Science, University of Victoria, 2002.

[4] H. H. Glover, J. P. Huneke, and C. S. Wang. 103 graphs that are irreducible for the projective plane. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, pages 332–370, 1979.

[5] K. Kuratowski. Sur le problème des courbes gauches en topologie. *Fund. Math.*, 15:271–283, 1930.

[6] B. Mohar and C. Thomassen. *Graphs on Surfaces*. Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, Baltimore, MD, 2001.

[7] B. Mohar and P. Škoda. Obstructions of connectivity 2 for embedding graphs into the torus. *Submitted*, 2012.

[8] E. Neufeld and W. Myrvold. Practical toroidality testing. In *Proceedings of the eigth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, SODA '97, pages 574–580. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 1997.

[9] R. B. Richter. On the euler genus of a 2-connected graph. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 43:60–69, 1987.

[10] R. B. Richter. On the non-orientable genus of a 2-connected graph. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 43:48–59, 1987.

[11] N. Robertson and P. D. Seymour. Graph minors. VIII. A Kuratowski theorem for general surfaces. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 48:255–288, 1990.

[12] N. Robertson, P. D. Seymour, and R. Thomas. Non-planar extensions of planar graphs. *Unpublished*, 2001.

[13] S. Stahl and L. W. Beineke. Blocks and the nonorientable genus of graphs. *J. Graph Theory*, 1(1):75–78, 1977.

[14] W. T. Tutte. How to draw a graph. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 13:743–767, 1963.

[15] J. Woodcock. A faster algorithm for torus embedding. Master's thesis, Dept. of Computer Science, University of Victoria, 2007.